

JAMES WHITE LIBRARY

*R. D. Hottel,
New Market,
Va.*

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE FIFTH

National Reform Convention,

TO AID IN MAINTAINING THE

CHRISTIAN FEATURES OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT,

AND SECURING A

RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT

TO THE

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES,

HELD IN

PITTSBURG, FEBRUARY 4, 5, 1874.

WITH A HISTORY OF THE

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF THE MOVEMENT.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED BY THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN ASSOCIATION,
No. 127 NORTH SEVENTH STREET.

OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.

PRESIDENT: THE HON. FELIX R. BRUNOT, Pittsburgh, Pa.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

The Hon. JAMES M. HARVEY, United States Senate.

The Hon. LORENZO SAWYER, U. S. Circuit Court, San Francisco, Cal.

The Hon. G. W. BROOKS, U. S. District Court of North Carolina.

The Hon. EDGAR W. HILLYER, U. S. District Court of Nevada.

The Hon. B. F. SAFFOLD, Supreme Court of Alabama.

The Hon C. C. COLE, LL.D., Supreme Court of Iowa.

The Hon. JAMES PHELIS, Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut.

The Hon. M. B. HAGANS, Superior Court of Cincinnati.

The Hon. J. ROCKWELL, Superior Court of Massachusetts.

The Hon. GEO. W. FRENCH, Chief Justice Supreme Court of Dakota.

The Hon. DAVID NOGGLES, Chief Justice Supreme Court of Idaho.

The Hon. MADISON E. HOLLISTER, Supreme Court of Idaho.

The Hon. ROGER S. GEENE, Supreme Court of Washington Territory.

The Hon. ROBERT W. FURNAS, Ex Governor of Nebraska.

The Hon. HEZEKIAH S. JOHNSON, Supreme Court of New Mexico.

The Hon. J. W. KING, AS, Supreme Court of Wyoming Territory.

The Hon. C. M. HAWLEY, Late Justice Supreme Court of Utah.

The Hon. J. W. McCLEURG, Ex Governor of Missouri.

The Hon. W. H. CUMBACK, Ex-Lieut. Governor of Indiana.

The Rt. Rev. WM. INGRAHAM KIP, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of California.

Pres. DAVID H. COCHRAN, Ph. D., LL.D., Col legiate and Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y.

The Rev. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D., Presb. Theo. Sem., Chicago, Ill.

Prof. E. KIRBY SMITH, University of Nashville, Tenn.

The Rev. GEO. B. CHEEVER, D.D., Englewood, N. J.

Prof. W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D., Princeton Theo. Sem., N. J.

The Rev. WM. R. NICHOLSON, D.D., Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., L.H.D., Union College, New York.

The Right Rev. JOHN B. KERFOOT, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Pittsburgh.

The Rev. T. L. CUYLER, D.D., Brooklyn.

The Rev. LEVI SCOTT, D.D., Bishop of the M. E. Church, Delaware.

The Hon. JULIUS H. SEELYE, U. S. House of Representatives.

The Right Rev. F. D. HUNTINGTON, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Centra' N. Y.

The Rev. A. A. MINER, D.D. LL.D., Boston.

The Rev. JONATHAN EDWARDS, D.D., Peoria, Ill.

The Rev. EDMUND S. JAMES, D.D., LL. D., Bishop of M. E. Church, N. Y.

The Rev. HENRY J. FOX, D.D., Charleston, S. C.

The Right Rev. W. M. GREEN, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Mississippi.

Vice Chancellor J. GORGAS, University of the South, Tennessee.

The Right Rev. G. T. BEDELL, D.D., Bishop of Prot. Epis. Church, Ohio.

The Hon. ELLIS A. AFGAR, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, New Jersey.

The Hon. A. N. FISHER, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada.

The Hon. JOSHUA H. DRUMMOND, LL.D., Portland, Maine.

JOHN ALEXANDER, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.

CHARLES G. NAZRO, Esq., Boston, Mass.

The Hon. THOMAS W. BICKNELL, Editor of *Journal of Education*, Boston.

JAMES W. TAYLOR, Esq., Newburg, N. Y.

WM. GETTY, Esq., Philadelphia.

The Right Rev. G. D. CUMMINS, D.D., Bishop of Reformed Episcopal Church.

The Rev. J. H. McILVAINE, D.D., Newark, N. J.

The Rev. M. SIMPSON, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the M. E. Church, Philadelphia.

The Rev. J. BLANCHARD, President of Wheaton College, Illinois.

Prof. O. N. STODDARD, LL.D., Wooster University, Ohio.

Prof. J. R. W. SLOANE, D.D., Ref. Pres. Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.

The Rev. E. R. CRAVEN, D.D., Newark, N. J.

The Rev. JOSEPH CUMMINGS, D.D., LL.D., Middletown, Conn.

The Rev. STEPHEN H. TYNG, D.D., N. Y.

The Rev. F. MERRICK, Ex-Pres. of the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.

The Rev. JOHN B. DALES, D.D., Philadelphia.

The Rev. JOSEPH T. COOPER, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Rev. Dr. J. BANVARD, Paterson, N. J.

The Rev. C. H. EDGAR, D.D., Easton, Pa.

The Rev. D. STEELE, D.D., Philadelphia.

(Continued on third page of cover.)

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

NATIONAL CONVENTION

TO SECURE THE

RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT

OF THE

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES,

HELD IN

PITTSBURG, FEBRUARY 4, 5, 1874.

WITH AN ACCOUNT OF THE

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF THE MOVEMENT.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED BY THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN ASSOCIATION, No. 104 N. SIXTH ST.

1874.

Vault
BR
516
N38
1874
HER

INTRODUCTION :

HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT TO SECURE THE RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT
OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, - - - -

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVENTION:

THE CALL,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
LETTERS FROM ABSENT FRIENDS,									35
RESOLUTION REFERRING TO THE NATIONAL CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION,									39
SUBSCRIPTION TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,									80
APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT,									26
"	"								26
"	"	PERMANENT ORGANIZATION,							39
"	"	RESOLUTIONS,							74
"	"	PETITIONS TO CONGRESS,							74
"	"	FINANCE,							80
"	"	NOMINATION OF OFFICERS,							80
REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PERMANENT ORGANIZATION,									35
"	"	RESOLUTIONS,							70
"	"	PETITIONS TO CONGRESS,							80
"	"	ENROLLMENT,							81
"	"	NOMINATION OF OFFICERS,							100
"		EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,							77
"		GENERAL SECRETARY,	"	"	"	"	"	"	77

ADDRESSES BEFORE THE CONVENTION:

THE ENDS WE SEEK.—By the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, Corresponding Secretary of the National Association,	26
ADDRESS OF THE HON. FELIX R. BRUNOT, President of the Convention,	30
TESTIMONIES TO THE RELIGIOUS DEFECT OF THE CONSTITUTION.—By the Rev. D. McAllister, General Secretary of the National Association,	40
RELATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THOSE WHO OPPOSE IT.—By the Rev. R. A. Brown, D.D.,	59
MORAL RESPONSIBILITY OF NATIONS.—By the Rev. D. R. Kerr, D.D.,	64
THE CONFLICT OF LAW.—By Prof. Chas. A. Blanchard,	68
ADDRESS OF DR. HODGE,	81
THE RELATION OF THE GOVERNMENT AND CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO CHRISTIANITY.—By the Hon. T. H. Baird Patterson,	98
NATURAL MORALS AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.—By the Rev. S. F. Scovel,	97
THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE OF THE NATION.—By Pres. Geo. P. Hays, D.D.,	99
OURNMENT.	103

PAGE

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF THE MOVEMENT

FOR THE

RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT

OF THE

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

By DAVID McALLISTER,

General Secretary of the National Association.

Two theories of the relation of civil government and religion have long been in conflict in our country. These two theories are essentially antagonistic. One maintains that government has nothing to do with religion but let it alone. It excludes all matters of religion from the true sphere of civil government. It separates not only the church, but all religion from the state. The other theory, while rejecting church establishments, holds that civil government has a proper and necessary connection with religion. The momentous issue between these two theories has come at length into distinct view, and the legitimate result of their conflict is the Movement for the Religious Amendment of the National Constitution.

There is no question in this controversy as to the theory of the union of Church and State. All are agreed that the civil establishment and endowment of any ecclesiastical body would be an evil. It is the relation of religion and the state, not of Church and State, which is the point in dispute. The connection existing in the early history of our country between the Church and the State was one mode of opposing the purely secular theory of government. But after the union of the church with the state was severed, the government still retained a connection with religion. This connection, in great measure yet existing, is attacked by the one theory, and defended by the other.

In this conflict the "secular" theory, or the theory which demands the complete divorce of the State from religion, is the assailant. Its "demands" are revolutionary. Its watchwords are "repeal," "abrogate," "discontinue," "abolish." It finds the Bible in our common schools, and demands its expulsion. It hears the voice of prayer in our halls of legislation, and demands that it be hushed. In a word, it finds the government, as such, in connection with the Christian religion, employing Christian ministers, calling the people to Christian exercises of worship, and in many other ways giving the preference to Christianity, as the true religion, above all false religions, and it demands the abrogation and abolition of everything in the nation's life which involves a governmental recognition of the religion of the fathers who settled the country, and of their sons whose Christian virtues have won for our nation whatever excellence and honor it may rightfully claim.

The great mass of the best citizens of our country have always rejoiced in the connection of our government with religion. They well understand that to sever the bond of connection between our nation and Christianity, would be to consign us to inevitable national ruin. To carry into execution the demands of "secularism" or "liberalism,"—the demands for the entire separation of our national life from the Christian religion, let them be called by what name they may,—would be to incur the certain infliction of the sentence, "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." (Isaiah lx. 12.)

The conflict between these two opposing theories of government has been fought heretofore on some local and special issue. The assailants have singled out some one particular Christian usage or law, and have been met at their own point of attack. The importance of the relation of the fundamental law of the nation to the constantly renewed controversy, did not at first appear. But with the repeated renewal of conflicts over Sabbath laws, the Bible in the schools, the oath, days of fasting and thanksgiving, chaplaincies, etc., the appeal to the written Constitution—the compact of agreement between the citizens of the nation—was sure, sooner or later, to be made.

Until quite recently, the friends of the Christian institutions of our government, satisfied with the actual connection existing between the nation and Christianity, gave themselves little concern as to the expression and authentication of that connection in the fundamental law. Multitudes of them, indeed, were painfully aware that our written Constitution contained no acknowledgment of God, or the Christian religion. The chain of testimony to its religious defect, given at

length in the Report contained in this volume, indicates how widely and deeply this defect was deplored. These men saw in this omission, a dishonor done to the God of nations, however unintentional on the part of the people generally, and they feared the consequences. But no organized attempt was made to supply the defect, until the enemies of our Christian institutions appealed to that instrument as the exponent of their theory, and demanded that as there was no acknowledgment of God or religion in the fundamental law of the nation, so there should be none in the political structure resting upon that foundation. The success with which this demand was pressed, in opposition to laws against the desecration of the Lord's day, and Christian instruction in public schools, and all similar institutions, at length aroused the more vigilant friends of civil and religious liberty to the necessity of an amendment to the Constitution.

From the array of testimony to the religious defect of the Constitution it will be seen that an unusual number of the most pointed and emphatic utterances cluster around two critical periods of our national history. It is no less true of nations than of individuals, that chastisement is needed to lead them to God. In the beginning of our revolutionary struggle, when we saw our danger and need of divine help, we sought the Lord as a nation, and we believe he heard our prayers. But when our independence was achieved, we forgot our Saviour. The Convention that framed our Constitution seemed to think, in the time of national peace, as Franklin said when trying in vain to have that body call on God in prayer, that the nation did not need, any longer, the divine assistance. And they neither invoked his guidance as a body in their momentous labors, nor acknowledged him in the instrument which they framed. "This neglect," said Dr. J. M. Mason, "excited in many of the best friends of the Constitution more alarm than all other difficulties." But in the forbearance and mercy of God, the nation prospered, and the dishonor done to God was largely forgotten. Though the chain of testimony to the religious defect of the Constitution was never broken, for many years preceding the war of 1812 but very few witnesses lifted up their voice. No sooner, however, did the clouds of war begin to gather, than the cry of warning broke forth from many of the highest places of the land. In the day of our calamity we saw and confessed our sin, and again we looked to God for help. Once more our prayers were heard. But with the removal of danger we again ignored our Helper. Our sense of sin in failing to acknowledge him was "as a morning cloud and as the early dew." And for nearly fifty years, years of almost unexampled material advancement, the religious defect of our Constitution seldom arrested

public attention. God never left himself without witnesses, but their voice, if heard, was unheeded. Again the Ruler of the nations set his throne of judgment. Our disregard of the rights of our fellow-men, closely connected with, and aggravated by, our disregard of the rights of God, brought us into deep waters. The floods of divine wrath beat against us. The very foundations of the nation were threatened. And now again voices are raised throughout the land in trumpet tones of warning. From the Senate Chamber of the nation; from numerous and most influential pulpits; from the columns of leading reviews and weekly journals; from chairs of political science in prominent institutions of learning, a united protest is heard against the religious defect of our Constitution. The rod of chastisement once more brought us to our senses.

Is it any wonder that many began to think it was time to take some practical steps toward remedying the acknowledged defect? If we should defer it until another season of judgment, who could tell whether God's patience might not be exhausted? To confess sin in time of trial, and make no effort at amendment when the calamities were mercifully removed, could only further provoke the divine displeasure. With such thoughts as these coming more or less clearly to the consciousness of many of our citizens, active measures were at length adopted with a view to the religious amendment of the United States Constitution.

The birth of the movement for this purpose may be dated from the 4th day of February, 1863. A Convention for prayer and Christian Conference, with special reference to the state of the country, had been called to meet in Xenia, Ohio, on February 3d, to continue in session three days. A programme had been published, setting forth the various subjects that were to engage the attention of the Convention. Among them was the subject of "Religion in the Nation." When the Convention assembled, it was found to include representatives from eleven different denominations of Christians, and from seven of the States of the Union. On the second day of the sessions of the Convention, when the subject of "Religion in the Nation" came up for consideration, John Alexander, Esq., then of Xenia, now of Philadelphia, presented a paper in which the sins of the nation were confessed, and the importance of repentance and reformation insisted upon. After speaking of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, then recently issued, and the hopeful prospect of an anti-slavery amendment to the Constitution, the paper proceeds as follows:

We regard the neglect of God and his law, by omitting all acknowledgment of them in our Constitution, as the crowning, original sin of the nation, and slavery as

one of its natural outgrowths. Therefore the most important step remains yet to be taken,—to amend the Constitution so as to acknowledge God and the authority of his law; and the object of this paper is to suggest to this Convention the propriety of considering this subject and of preparing such an amendment to the Constitution as they may think proper to propose in accordance with its provisions.

In order to bring the subject more definitely before the Convention, we suggest the following as an outline of what seems to us to be needed in the preamble of that instrument, making it read as follows:—(proposed amendment in brackets):—

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, [recognizing the being and attributes of Almighty God, the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, the law of God as the paramount rule, and Jesus, the Messiah, the Saviour and Lord of all,] in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

This paper was referred to a committee who reported favorably upon it. This committee was composed of representatives of all the denominations gathered in the Convention. After some discussion, their report, recommending the approval of the spirit and design of the paper, endorsing the action which it proposed, and ordering its publication, was adopted.

It is not a little remarkable that just about the same time, in a distant State, another Convention, of a similar character, took similar action. Without any knowledge whatever of the Xenia Convention, a Convention of Christians of various denominations met in Sparta, Illinois, on Feb. 6, 1863, just two days after the adoption of the foregoing paper. At this gathering a series of resolutions was adopted, in which a pledge was given to "labor to bring the nation to repentance toward God, and to a faithful administration of the government according to the principles of the word of God." This Convention adjourned to meet on Feb. 24, some two weeks later, to adopt a plan of operations. At this meeting an association was organized, one express object of which was to bring the nation to an acknowledgment of the authority of Christ and his law.

Following up the action of the Xenia Convention, a number of ministers and laymen, of various Christian bodies, met in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, on May 8th, 1863. The Rev. J. T. Pressly, D. D., was called to the chair. The object of this meeting was stated by the chairman to be "to recommend to the respective supreme judicatories of the church, about to meet, to appoint delegates to a national council, to be held some time during the summer, whose business it shall be to memorialize and urge upon Congress the importance of having the National Constitution so amended as to

embody a more distinct recognition of Almighty God, the headship of Christ over the nations of the earth, and the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures." The action of this meeting, taken on Monday of the succeeding week, was as follows:

1. We suggest that the National Religious Council be held on the 4th of July next, in the city of Pittsburgh, to adopt a proposed amendment.
2. We suggest that all Evangelical denominations be invited to send four delegates to said council.
3. We suggest that a committee be appointed to publish an address to the nation on this subject as soon as possible; and that a committee of five be appointed to extend an invitation to the various bodies of Christians throughout the land to attend said council.

The form of amendment proposed by Mr. Alexander, in his paper presented to the Xenia Convention, was adopted at this meeting.

In accordance with the action of this Convention, an admirable address to the people of the country, prepared by Dr. J. T. Pressly, was issued and widely circulated. But the plan for a National Council met with little success. Only a few delegates met in Pittsburgh on the 4th of July. The failure of this plan demonstrated to many of the friends of the movement that a different course must be followed. As it was a movement for a great *civil and national* purpose, it must be placed on a civil and national basis. Members of ecclesiastical courts must unite in the movement, not as members of ecclesiastical courts, but as American citizens. All who are interested in the welfare of the nation, and who see that its highest welfare can be secured only by a sincere acknowledgment of God, and Christ, and the Bible, must be invited to co-operate. In keeping with this view of the movement, the friends who met on July 4th, took steps to call a National Convention of all citizens favorable to the measure, without any distinction of party or creed. A Central Committee, which had been appointed for the purpose, called a Convention to meet in Allegheny City, on Wednesday, Jan. 27th, 1864. At once a deep interest was manifested. The Convention met according to appointment, was so well attended, and was characterized by such an earnest, prayerful, and hopeful spirit, that every one present felt that a mighty social movement had been fairly inaugurated. Three important practical steps marked this Convention: 1. The preparation of a memorial for signature and presentation to Congress. 2. The appointment of a Committee to visit the President, and endeavor to obtain a special message to Congress on the subject. 3. The organization of a National Association. As this Convention forms an epoch in the history of this movement, its action is here given in full:

RESOLUTIONS.

- Resolved*, 1. That we deem it a matter of paramount interest to the life, and prosperity, and permanency of our nation, that its Constitution be so amended as fully to express the Christian national character.
2. That we are encouraged by the success attending the labors of the friends of this movement to persevere, in the hope that, with the blessing of God, this effort will speedily result in the consummation of this great object.
3. That in the late proclamations of His Excellency, the President of the United States, recommending the observance of days of national fasting, humiliation and prayer, (as suggested by the Senate of the United States,) for the purpose of confessing our national sins, which have provoked the Divine displeasure, and of imploring forgiveness through Jesus Christ—and also days of national thanksgiving for the purpose of making grateful acknowledgment of God's mercies—we have pleasing evidence that God is graciously inclining the hearts of those who are in authority over us to recognize his hand in the affairs of the nation, and to cherish a sense of our dependence on him.
4. That the following memorial and petition to Congress be circulated throughout the United States for signatures:

MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled:

We, citizens of the United States, respectfully ask your honorable bodies to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States, so as to read, in substance, as follows:

"We, the people of the United States, [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian government,] and in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and [secure the inalienable rights and blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to ourselves, our posterity, and all the people,] do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

"And further: that such changes with respect to the oath of office, slavery, and all other matters, should be introduced into the body of the Constitution as may be necessary to give effect to these amendments in the preamble. And we, your humble petitioners, will ever pray."

Resolved, That a special committee be appointed to carry the memorial to Washington and lay it before the President, and endeavor to get a special message to Congress on the subject, and to lay said memorial before Congress.

FORM OF PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.*

1. This Association shall be called the "NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION."
2. The object of this Association shall be to obtain such amendment of the Constitution of the United States as shall fully express the Christian national character according to the resolutions adopted by this Convention.

* The Constitution of the National Association has since been remodelled. It may be found, in its present form, on the third page of the cover of this volume.

3. The officers shall be a President, Vice-President, Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, and Treasurer. These, with five other members, shall be the Executive Committee of the Association, any five of whom shall be a quorum—all to be elected at the annual meeting.

4. Persons may become members by assenting to the Constitution.

5. This Association shall meet annually upon its own adjournment, and at the call of its officers.

Mr. Alexander, with whose Christian and patriotic action the movement may be said to have originated, was appropriately chosen the first President of the National Association. Zadok Street, Esq., of Salem, Ohio, a member of the Society of Friends, was elected Vice-President. Members of several other denominations were on the list of officers, giving to the Association, at the very beginning, that unsectarian character which it has always maintained.

The special committee appointed to visit Washington, to urge the proposed Amendment on the attention of President Lincoln, embracing Professor J. H. McILVAINE, D.D., Princeton, N. J.; Professor J. T. PRESSLY, D.D., Penn.; Rev. John DOUGLAS, D.D., Penn.; Rev. D. C. PAGE, D.D., Pa.; Rev. H. H. GEORGE, Ohio; Dr. STERRETT, Pa.; JOHN ALEXANDER, Esq., Ohio; Rev. J. S. T. MILLIGAN, Mich.; Rev. R. A. BROWNE, D. D., Pa.; and Rev. A. M. MILLIGAN, Pa., met in Willard's Hotel, Washington, on Tuesday evening, February 9. The Rev. Dr. GURLEY, Rev. Dr. CHANNING, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate, J. J. MARKS, D.D., Rev. B. F. MORRIS, Rev. L. D. JOHNSON, and Rev. N. K. CROWE, of the District of Columbia, met with the delegation, heard the address prepared by Dr. McILVAINE, the Chairman of the Committee, and gave it their hearty sanction. Most of them signed the address and waited on the President with the delegation. Through the aid of Senator SHERMAN, of Ohio, an arrangement was made with the President for an interview on Wednesday, at half past three P. M., when the delegation was introduced to the President by Dr. GURLEY.

After listening with deep attention to the address in which the committee presented their cause, the President said:—

GENTLEMEN: The general aspect of your movement I cordially approve. In regard to particulars I must ask time to deliberate, as the work of amending the Constitution should not be done hastily. I will carefully examine your paper in order more fully to comprehend its contents than is possible from merely hearing it read, and will take such action upon it as my responsibility to our Maker and our country demands.

This Convention also arranged for the appointment of sub-committees to organize auxiliary associations, and help forward the circulation of petitions to Congress for signatures. The effect of the work

of this Convention distinctly appeared at the meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, (O. S.), in Newark, the following May. This body, one of the largest and most influential in the country, in answer to an overture on the subject from the Synod of the Pacific, adopted the following preamble and resolutions, offered by Dr. Musgrave:

Whereas, Almighty God, the God of nations, is the head and source of all authority and power in civil government, and nations as such are the subjects of his moral laws, and his revealed will is the supreme law of national life;

Whereas, The Christian and loyal people of our country are everywhere beseeching God to interpose for our deliverance as a nation from the assaults of a most groundless and wicked rebellion, and to establish and maintain the national unity and authority; and

Whereas, Resolutions have already passed the Senate of the United States, and are pending in the House of Representatives, recommending the Amendment of the National Constitution in several other particulars: Therefore,

Resolved, That it is our solemn national duty so to amend our fundamental and organic law, that the preamble of the National Constitution shall read in substance as follows: "We, the people of the United States," &c., (in the words of the proposed amendment.)

Resolved, That this General Assembly recommend to all the people in the congregations under its care to memorialize Congress upon this subject.

The Convention held in Allegheny in January of this year, (1864,) having been a special meeting to effect a permanent organization, the Executive Committee determined to call the first annual meeting of the National Association in Philadelphia in July following. It was held accordingly in the Eighth St. Methodist Episcopal Church, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 7th and 8th days of that month. Though the meeting was not large, the character and position of those present, and the interest manifested in the cause, were exceedingly encouraging. Addresses were made by the Rev. D. C. EDDY, D.D., of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, and the Rev. J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., of the German Reformed Church. Dr. EDDY was elected President of the Association for the ensuing year. The Rev. T. P. STEVENSON, W. W. SPEAR, D.D., and Wm. GETTY, Esq., were appointed a Committee on Correspondence, and were directed to prepare an address to the public in behalf of the cause.

At this annual meeting the memorial to Congress, as prepared by the Convention in Allegheny, was slightly changed. It was put into the following form: *

* The form of Memorial has been slightly altered at different times. The clause concerning liberty was dropped after the Amendment to the Constitution prohibiting slavery was adopted. The National Association has always held, as was expressly declared at the New-York Convention in 1873, that it "does not regard as at all essential the precise form of petition sent to Congress in the interest

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled:

We, citizens of the United States, respectfully petition your honorable bodies to adopt such measures as may be necessary for amending the National Constitution, so that it may read in substance as follows:

We, the people of the United States, [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Governor among the nations, and His revealed will as of supreme authority, in order to constitute a Christian government, and] in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, [and secure the inalienable rights and blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to ourselves, our posterity, and all the inhabitants of the land,] do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

And we further petition that such changes as may be necessary to give effect to these amendments of the preamble may be introduced into the body of the Constitution; and we, your humble petitioners, will ever pray, etc.

The following Resolutions, in which the unsectarian and purely civil, as opposed to ecclesiastical, character of the movement is emphasized, were adopted at this first annual meeting:

Resolved, That we understand the voice of God in his providence toward this nation, at the present time, as calling upon all Christians and all patriots to prosecute the work in which this Association is engaged, with increased diligence and zeal.

Resolved, That as the object at which we aim involves nothing of a sectarian character, but concerns every lover of his country, we invite the co-operation of all Christian denominations, and all persons friendly to the proposed amendments.

Resolved, That in order to the attainment of the object of the Association, it is highly important to engage the religious and secular press in the discussion and dissemination of the principles involved in the proposed amendment of the National Constitution.

So great was the encouragement of the Association that, before adjourning, it was agreed to hold another Convention in Philadelphia on the last Tuesday of October, at 7½ P. M. It was subsequently found necessary to change the time, and the Convention was held in the West Arch Street Presbyterian Church, on the 29th of November, 1864. Ex-Governor POLLOCK presided, and addresses of unusual interest and power were made by JUDGE STRONG, Dr. EDWARDS, Dr. McILVAINE, Dr. GEORGE JUNKIN, Dr. JOEL SWARTZ, (Lutheran,) of

of this reform, provided the main issue be fairly included." (See Resolutions, p. 17.) At the same Convention the following and most recent form of Memorial was agreed upon:

To the Honorable, the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, citizens of the United States, petition your honorable bodies for such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as shall suitably express our national acknowledgment of Almighty God, as the source of all authority in civil government; of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and of his revealed will as of supreme authority; and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of the government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.

Baltimore, and the Rev. Dr. GODDARD, (Episcopal,) of Philadelphia. Delegates were present from different parts of the country, and altogether it was a very encouraging meeting. The following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That a national recognition of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Scriptures, as proposed in the memorial of this Association to Congress, is clearly a scriptural duty, which it is national peril to disregard.

Resolved, That, in consideration of the general diffusion of religious intelligence, principles, and institutions throughout our country—in view of the many express recognitions of Christianity by the Constitutions and the legislative enactments of the several States—and in view also, of the religious history of the founders of this Government, it is a striking and solemn fact that our present National Constitution is so devoid of any distinctive Christian feature, that one of our Chief Magistrates once refused to appoint a day of fasting and prayer in an hour of public calamity, because the nation, in its Constitution, recognized no God; and another, in contracting a treaty with a Mohammedan power, hesitated not to declare that "the Government of the United States is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion. It has in itself no character of enmity against the laws and religion of Mussulmans."

Resolved, That the measures proposed by this Association are not sectional, nor sectarian, nor partisan, but the general voice of Christian patriotism, asking that which is right and wholesome, which is in keeping with our antecedents, and which will not operate oppressively upon the conscience of any citizen.

Resolved, That the state of the times, recent and present, and the state of public sentiment, warrants and encourages the attempt to secure the amendment to the Constitution which is proposed by this Association.

The work of the Association was continued during the following years, with an annual meeting in the city of New York, May 16th and 17th, 1866, and local meetings of the friends of the movement in various portions of the country. The local Association in Southern Illinois had in the meantime become a power for good, under the name of "The Christian Association of Southern Illinois for National Reformation." It vigorously pushed forward the work, by circulating the petition to Congress, publishing and distributing tracts and addresses, and supporting lecturers and travelling agents. For nearly two years it employed the Rev. James Wallace, who devoted his whole time to the work of disseminating the truth, far and wide, on this important subject.

In the State of Indiana also, the work was energetically carried forward, where, through the efforts of the Rev. John Crozier, a Convention was assembled in Indianapolis, on Feb. 15th, 1865, to secure suitable religious acknowledgments in the Constitution of that State; amendments to which were at that time under discussion in the Legislature. Petitions were widely circulated, and numerous signed, and

a favorable report obtained in the Legislature, but that body adjourned without acting on the report.

Nothing worthy of special note occurred after the New York meeting of 1866, until the annual meeting of 1867. This was held in Philadelphia, on the 5th and 6th of March. Addresses were made by Prof. McIlvaine, of Princeton, the Rev. J. R. W. Sloane, of New York, and the Rev. R. Audley Browne, D. D., then a member of the Pennsylvania Senate. The Hon. Wm. Strong, now of the Supreme Court of the United States, presided at this meeting, and was elected President of the National Association.

A Convention of the citizens of Western Pennsylvania was held in the following month, (April 9, 1867) at Pittsburgh, at which a local Association was formed and the following resolutions were adopted:

WHEREAS, The people composing this nation, the common law, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and laws of the several States, and in general the laws and practices of the General Government, are not only in consonance with but also derive their glory from, Christianity; and whereas, There is not in the Constitution of the United States any express recognition of Jehovah, of his Anointed King, the Lord Jesus Christ, or of his Revealed Will, as exercising any authority in, or receiving any honor from, the nation; and whereas, The Constitution professes to be the ordinance of the people, and should, therefore, reflect their sentiments; therefore;

Resolved 1. That it is the mind of this Convention that these amendments ought to be made: first, because they state facts which are as incontrovertible as they are solemn; second, because they truly express what, if properly understood, is the firm conviction of the overwhelming majority of this people; third, because God commands it, and it is perilous to disregard a divine command.

2. That in this proposed amendment there is implied no disrespect to the Constitution nor any lack of loyalty to the Government, since other amendments, as well as this, are shown by the events of the war, to be timely and necessary; since even a defective government may still be a valid government; and since, whatever may be the defects of the American Constitution, we glory in it and boast of it as the wisest and best Constitution ever framed by a nation.

3. That this proposed amendment does not tend nor look toward any union of Church and State, nor does it involve any principle which in any development or any application recognizes such union as either profitable, useful, or even endurable.

4. That it becomes American citizens to be true to their religious convictions, and manly in asserting them, and this proposed amendment furnishes a just occasion for them to be so.

5. That in the judgment of this Convention, the times in which we live indicate it as perilous to all public interests, and dishonoring to our very civilization, that our National Constitution should continue to ignore God and his Christ. Our rulers and judges should be wise on this point. They should be instructed that, according to the teachings of the second Psalm, it is both heathenish and ruinous.

6. That it is proper that a local association be organized in this city auxiliary to

the aims of the National Association, and so far as practicable under the same Constitution, with an Executive Committee, charged not only to communicate and co-operate with the National Association, but also to form branch associations in all the neighboring region.

This brings up the record to the autumn of 1867. The necessity of a special medium of communication between the rapidly multiplying friends of the movement had long been felt, and more than one effort had been made to establish a journal. Tracts had been widely disseminated, and the columns of many magazines and papers had been employed to good purpose in the discussion of this subject. But something more had at length become imperatively necessary for the prosecution of the work. Accordingly, after prayerful consideration, the publication of a semi-monthly journal, the *CHRISTIAN STATESMAN*, was begun the 1st of September, 1867, by the Rev. T. P. Stevenson and the writer of this article. In 1872 this sheet was changed to a weekly; and the next year it was much improved, and issued from a printing office expressly fitted up for the increasing work of the movement. From this centre, tracts and circulars by hundreds of thousands, the reports of the proceedings of Conventions, and other important documents, now go forth throughout the whole country, and across the ocean, on their patriotic mission.

Many of the documents to which reference is made in this sketch, are given in full in the report of the Convention held in Cincinnati in 1872. As this report has already become somewhat scarce, and as earlier reports were not published in pamphlet form, the calls for the four principal National Conventions preceding the one reported in this volume, are here annexed, together with the resolutions adopted. Any one who desires a fuller record of these great Conventions, or accounts of other meetings, or any further information on the subject, will find the seven volumes of the *CHRISTIAN STATESMAN* as complete a record as was ever connected with any movement of the kind.

CALL FOR THE PITTSBURGH CONVENTION.

The Constitution of the United States makes no acknowledgment of Almighty God, the Author of national existence; nor of Jesus Christ, who is the Ruler of Nations; nor of the Bible, which is the Fountain of law and good morals, as well as of religion. This has, from the beginning, been a matter of deep regret. It may have been an oversight, but it was, and it is, both an error and an evil. It does not reflect the views of the great majority of the people upon these matters. It dishonors God. It is inconsistent with the character of nearly all our State Constitutions, and with all the precedents of our early history. It has introduced, or furthered, views and measures which are now struggling for a baneful ascendancy in State and national politics: such as, that civil government is only a social compact; that it exists only for secular and material, not for moral ends; that Sabbath laws are unconstitutional, and that the Bible must be excluded from our public schools.

The National Association, which has been formed for the purpose of securing such an amendment to the National Constitution as will remedy this great defect, indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions and usages in our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the nation, invites, &c.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT PITTSBURGH.

Resolved, 1. That civil government is grounded, like the family, in the principles of the nature of man as a social creature; that it has its powers and functions thus determined by the Creator, and is, therefore, like the family, an ordinance of God.

2. That nations, as sovereignties, wielding moral as well as physical power, and having moral as well as material objects, are morally accountable to God.

3. That the moral laws under which nations are held accountable, include not only the law written on the heart of man, but also the fuller revelation of the Divine character and will, given in the Bible.

4. That it is the right of nations as such, no less than of the individuals composing them, to worship God according to the religion of Jesus Christ.

5. That in order to maintain and give permanency to the Christian features which have marked this nation from its origin, it is necessary to give them authoritative sanction in our organic law.

6. That the proposed amendment of our National Constitution, so far from infringing any individual's rights of conscience, or tending in the least degree to a union of Church and State, will afford the fullest security against a corrupt and corrupting church establishment, and form the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens.

7. That the present movement is not sectarian, nor even ecclesiastical, but that it is the assertion of the right, and acknowledgment of the duty of a people who believe in the Christian religion to govern themselves in a Christian manner.

CALL FOR THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION.

There is no political document so all-important to the American statesman and the American citizen as the Constitution of the United States. All law, all customs, all forms of administration are shaped by it. Everything in any State, corporation or business that affects a citizen in the remotest degree as to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," is tested by it, and stands and works only as it agrees with it. Year by year its moulding power is felt. The President, the Congress and the Courts are coming more and more into evident agreement with what is there written. Our statesmen and our whole people are learning their Americanism, as to its letter and spirit, from that great instrument. This is as it should be. This was intended from the beginning.

But, at the same time, it is a serious matter if that Constitution should be found wanting in any principle or any matter of fact. The deficiency will in due time work mischief. Error in the Constitution will work as powerfully as truth, and what is left out of it may one day be formally declared un-American. And one such serious matter there is; one unnecessary and most unfortunate omission. God and Christianity are not once alluded to; although the Constitution is itself the product of a Christian civilization, and although it purports to represent the mind of a Christian people, who in all their State Constitutions had made explicit reference

to both God and religion. Hence it is that all the laws of this country in favor of a Christian morality are enacted and enforced outside of the Constitution. They rest only upon the basis of what is called Common Law. We have, strictly, no oath, no law against blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking nor polygamy that has any better foundation. And, as matters seem to be going, it will soon be discovered and decreed that common law is only another name for custom, which has no binding force. And then where are we? In atheism, corruption and anarchy.

The National Association which has been formed, &c.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT PHILADELPHIA.

Resolved, 1. That this Convention of those who aim to secure a religious amendment to our National Constitution, gratefully acknowledges the good providence of God in the evident progress of this cause during the past year.

2. That, with the conviction that under God all that is wanting for its ultimate and early triumph is the publication and illustration of the facts and the principles upon which it is based, we pledge ourselves to renewed zeal in its prosecution.

3. That this Convention renewedly calls the attention of the American people to the fact that in some of our treaties with foreign governments, which are of equal authority with the Constitution itself, we are declared to be a nation in no sense founded upon Christianity, and not (formally) unlike Mohammedans.

4. That this Convention reiterates with an increased and solemn appreciation of their importance the following principles of moral and political philosophy, which, in substance, have been set forth by former Conventions, viz:

That civil government in the earth stands for its right of existence upon the same basis with the family, both being the appointments of the God of nature and morality, and that nations, like families, are public persons, with moral character, with rights, duties, and responsibilities.

That the continued ignoring of God and religion exposes us to the guilt of formal national Atheism.

That the nation constituted by the union of the thirteen British-American Colonies was a Christian nation, as is shown by their several Colonial histories and separate State Constitutions, and therefore it was and is no more than simple justice to the people to reflect their sentiments in the National Constitution.

5. That, in view of the controlling power of the Constitution, in shaping State as well as National policy, it is of immediate importance to public morals and to social order, to secure "such an amendment to the Constitution as will remedy this great defect, indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the nation;" especially those which secure a proper oath, and which protect society against blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, and polygamy.

CALL FOR THE CINCINNATI CONVENTION.

Government is instituted for man as an intellectual, social, and moral and religious being. It corresponds to his whole nature. It is intended to protect and advance the higher as well as the lower interests of humanity. It acts for its legitimate purposes when it watches over domestic life, and asserts and enforces the sanctity of the marriage bond; when it watches over intellect and education, and furnishes means for developing all the faculties of the mind; when it frowns on profaneness, lewdness, the desecration of the Sabbath, and other crimes which injure

society chiefly by weakening moral and religious sentiment, and degrading the character of a people.

Acting for such purposes, government should be established on moral principles. Moral principles of conduct are determined by moral relations. The relations of a nation to God and His moral laws are clear and definite:

1. A nation is the creature of God.
2. It is clothed with authority derived from God.
3. It owes allegiance to Jesus Christ, the appointed Ruler of nations.
4. It is subject to the authority of the Bible, the special revelation of moral law.

In constituting and administering its Government, then, a nation is under obligations to acknowledge God as the author of its existence and the source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its ruler, and the Bible as the fountain of its laws, and the supreme rule of its conduct.

Up to the time of the adoption of the National Constitution, acknowledgments of this kind were made by all the States. They are yet made by many of the States. And in the actual administration of the national Government the principle is admitted. But the fundamental law of the nation, the Constitution of the United States, on which our Government rests, and according to which it is to be administered, fails to make, full and explicitly, any such acknowledgment. This failure has fostered among us mischievous ideas like the following: The nation, as such, has no relations to God; its authority has no higher source than the will of the people; Government is instituted only for the lower wants of man; the State goes beyond its sphere when it educates religiously, or legislates against profanity or Sabbath desecration.

The National Association which has been formed, &c.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT CINCINNATI.

Resolved, 1. That the State, as a power claiming and exercising supreme jurisdiction over vast numbers of human beings, as the sovereign arbiter of life and death, and as an educating power, has necessarily a moral character and accountability of its own.

2. That it is the right and duty of the United States, as a nation settled by Christians, a nation with Christian laws and usages, and with Christianity as its greatest social force, to acknowledge itself, in its written Constitution, to be a Christian nation.

3. That as the disregard of sound theory always leads to mischievous practical results, so in this case the failure of our nation to acknowledge, in its organic law, its relation to God and His moral laws, as a Christian nation, has fostered the theory that government has nothing to do with religion, and that consequently laws in favor of the Sabbath, Christian marriage, and the use of the Bible in the schools, are unconstitutional.

4. That we recognize the necessity of complete harmony between our written Constitution and the actual facts of the National life; and we maintain that the true way to effect this undoubted harmony is not to expel the Bible and all idea of God and religion from our schools, abrogate laws enforcing Christian morality, and abolish all devout observances in connection with Government, but to insert an explicit acknowledgment of God and the Bible in our fundamental law.

5. That the proposed religious Amendment, so far from tending to a union of Church and State, is directly opposed to such union, inasmuch as it recog-

nizes the nation's relations to God, and insists that the nation should acknowledge these relations for itself, and not through the medium of any Church establishment.

CALL FOR THE NEW YORK CONVENTION.

The Question of the Bible in the Public Schools, of Sabbath Laws, and many similar questions, are now demanding attention and decisive settlement. Shall the Nation preserve the Christian features of its life? This is rapidly becoming the issue of our day.

Many thoughtful citizens view with deep concern the assaults now being made on everything of a Christian character in our civil institutions. Not only time-serving politicians and irreligious men, but eminent officers of government, and leaders among Christians, accepting the false theory that government has nothing to do with religion, co-operate in these assaults.

An appeal against the Bible in the Common Schools now lies before the Supreme Court of Ohio. It will come up for adjudication, in its regular order, some time this winter, when a determined effort will be made to overturn the present noble school system of that State.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of New York has recently decided that the Bible, though assigned an honorable place in the State system of education when first established, and actually used for sixty years, can no longer be legally read during regular hours in any school of the State. Armed with authoritative decisions like this, the enemies of the Bible certainly will succeed, unless the friends of our Common Schools awake to the dangers that threaten them, and take prompt and adequate action.

In order successfully to repel their assaults, the assailants must be met at their own point of attack. They assail the Bible in the Schools, Sabbath Laws, Laws against Polygamy, and every similar element of our Christian civilization, on the ground of their inconsistency with the Constitution of the United States, which acknowledges neither God nor the Bible, and with which everything in the actual administration of the Government should harmonize.

What shall be done? This is the momentous question now forcing itself upon the American people. It will not down. It must soon be answered in one of two ways. Which shall it be? Shall we obliterate every Christian feature from existing institutions? Or, shall we make the Constitution explicitly Christian? Shall we thrust out the Bible from our schools to make them conform to the Constitution? Patriotism and true Statesmanship answer, No! But let the acknowledgment of God and the Bible be inserted in the Constitution to make it conform to the Common Schools.

The National Association, &c.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT NEW YORK.

Resolved, 1. That this Ninth General Convention of the National Association for the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States re-affirms its deep conviction of the greatness and the necessity of the work in which it is engaged.

2. That the principles which underlie this movement commend themselves to the common sense and the consciences of men as true, as practical, and as of great importance.

3. That, in the judgment of this Convention, a nation and an administration of government can no more exist without moral character, moral influence and religion, than without a language, and that any attempt to do so is not only absurd, but dangerous.

4. That it is the clear right and duty of a Christian people to make in their national Constitution solemn acknowledgment of God as the author of government, and to make unmistakable mention of their preference of Christianity as their religion, both that God may thus be duly honored, and that legal presumptions may be created in favor of Christian morality, Christian usages, and Christian institutions.

5. That such acknowledgment of God and of revelation is not designed, and does not tend in any wise to oppress any individual conscience, or to effect any union of Church and State, nor can it ever be pleaded, used, or even perverted, to such injurious ends.

6. That this Convention does not regard as at all essential the precise form of petition sent to Congress in the interests of this Reform, provided the main issue be fairly included, viz., that it is impossible for a State to be neutral in religion and morals; and that the Christian religion is an essential element in American civilization, as shown in the whole history of this country.

7. That the signs of the times, the rapid deterioration of public morals, and the bold demands of organized political infidelity, show conclusively and impressively, that the alternative now presented to the American people is Atheism or Christianity, and that failure to adopt this proposed amendment involves ultimately general immorality and anarchy.

8. That, thanking God and taking courage upon a review of the past, this Convention declares the time to be fully come for more extended agencies than have heretofore been employed, and that especially it is important to secure systematic and liberal contributions of funds for this purpose.

The Convention, of which the following pages give the proceedings, was properly the Fifth *National* Convention. Although several Conventions were held in the first five years of the history of our movement, none deserved the name of an annual National Convention until that which met in Pittsburgh in February, 1870. The four succeeding Conventions, in Philadelphia, Cincinnati, New York, and now again in Pittsburgh, have each surpassed the last, in the number of delegates, and the interest and power of the proceedings. Between no two Conventions have the evidences of progress been so numerous and encouraging as during the past year.

According to the report of the Committee of Enrollment, found in the proceedings, the Convention was composed of *one thousand and sixty-four* members; *six hundred and forty-one* bore certificates of their appointment at public meetings, to represent their fellow-citizens in this Assembly. So large a body, composed almost altogether of men, and men, evidently, of intelligence and social influence, presented an aspect of strength and dignity which was exceedingly impressive. At no time was this so noticeable as when the whole assembly, crowding

floor and galleries of the beautiful hall in which we were met, rose to their feet, as one man, to adopt the "Declaration of Principles," which sets forth seasonably the practical aims of the movement, and the resolute spirit in which they are sought.

The Pittsburgh daily papers treated the Convention with the utmost fairness and generosity. The *Commercial* did for us what has never been done for any religious assembly in the United States, except by the *Tribune* for the Evangelical Alliance at its recent conference in New York. All the proceedings were reported in full, every address being printed from the author's manuscript. On the day after the Convention adjourned, the reports of the two days' proceedings were thrown together, and printed in an extra edition, of which many thousand copies were published. In this way our cause obtained a wider hearing than ever before.

This edition of the Report is sent forth with the prayer that He whose honor this movement seeks to promote, and who has so remarkably vouchsafed his blessing hitherto, will carry forward the glorious work until our beloved nation shall become one of the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

NATIONAL CONVENTION,

HELD IN

PITTSBURGH, FEBRUARY 4 & 5, 1874.

The Fifth National Convention to secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, assembled in Library Hall, Pittsburgh, on Wednesday, February 4th, at two o'clock, P. M. The Hon. Felix R. Brunot, President of the National Association, called the Convention to order, and on his motion, the Rev. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D., was chosen temporary Chairman. At the request of Dr. Sloane, the Rev. Dr. Hodge led the Assembly in prayer. The Chairman then read the call for the Convention, as follows:

CALL FOR THE CONVENTION.

The people of the United States are awakening to the fact that the National Constitution is destitute of any explicit acknowledgment of God or the Christian religion. Although it is the fundamental law of a great Christian people, its want of a distinct Christian character has led even such men as Dr. Woolsey, ex-President of Yale College, to state that it would need no change to adapt it to a Mohammedan nation.

Thus, many of the friends, as well as the foes, of Christianity are pointing out a strange inconsistency. While it is an indisputable fact that our Government is, and always has been, administered in connection with the Christian religion, that many of its laws, customs, and institutions are distinctively Christian, it is yet maintained on the one side, and admitted on the other, that the Constitution, with which all our laws and institutions should accord, is no more Christian than Mohammedan.

This inconsistency, long a matter of deep regret to many of our best citizens, is now a cause of alarm. It is being used persistently, and in many instances successfully, against the Christian institutions of our nation. It is made the basis of the most

dangerous assaults on the use of the Bible in the common schools, the oath, Sabbath laws, public fasts and thanksgivings, prayers in Congress and State Legislatures, and all other similar features of our national life.

And now the momentous issue is before us as American citizens; How shall we harmonize the inconsistency? Shall we prove faithless to the inheritance bequeathed to us by Christian fathers, and permit our best institutions to be overthrown on the ground that they are opposed to the Constitution? Are these times of political corruption, financial disaster, pestilence, and want, times for us, as a nation, to depart farther from God? Shall we not rather, faithful to our trust as Christian citizens, and realizing our dependence on Divine strength and wisdom, harmonize whatever may be inconsistent in the Constitution and government, by a reverent acknowledgment, in both, of Almighty God and his revealed will.

A National Association has been formed to secure such an Amendment to the Constitution as will suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the author of the nation's existence, and the ultimate source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its ruler, and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct, and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. This Association invites all citizens who favor such an Amendment, without distinction of party or creed, to meet in LIBRARY HALL, Pittsburgh, on Wednesday, February 4th, 1874, at 2 o'clock P. M.

All such citizens, to whose notice this call may be brought, are requested to hold meetings, and appoint delegates to the Convention.

FELIX R. BRUNOT,

President of the National Association.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

- His Excellency, JAMES M. HARVEY, *Governor of Kansas.*
 The Hon. J. M. McCLURG, *Ex-Governor of Missouri.*
 The Hon. W. H. CUMBACK, *Lieut-Governor of Indiana.*
 The Hon. LORENZO SAWYER, *U. S. Circuit Court, San Francisco, Cal.*
 The Hon. G. W. BROOKS, *U. S. District Court of North Carolina.*
 The Hon. M. B. HAGANS, *Superior Court of Cincinnati.*
 The Hon. J. ROCKWELL, *Superior Court of Massachusetts.*
 The Hon. ELLIS A. APGAR, *State Superintendent of Public Instruction, New Jersey.*
 The Hon. A. N. FISHER, *State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada.*
 The Hon. JOSIAH H. DRUMMOND, LL.D., *Portland, Maine.*
 JOHN ALEXANDER, Esq., *Philadelphia, Pa.*
 CHARLES G. NAZRO, Esq., *Boston, Mass.*
 The Hon. THOMAS W. BICKNELL, *Commissioner of Public Schools, R. I.*
 JAMES W. TAYLOR, Esq., *Newburg, N. Y.*
 Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., *Union College, N. Y.*
 The Right Rev. JOHN B. KERFOOT, *Bishop Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Pittsburgh.*
 The Rev. T. L. CUYLER, D.D., *Brooklyn, N. Y.*
 The Rev. LEVI SCOTT, D.D., *Bishop of the M. E. Church, Delaware.*
 Prof. JULIUS H. SEELYE, D.D., *Amherst College, Mass.*
 The Right Rev. F. D. HUNTINGDON, D.D., *Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Central N. Y.*

- The Rev. A. A. MINER, D.D., *President of Tufts College, Mass.*
 The Rev. JONAHAN EDWARDS, D.D., *Peoria, Ill.*
 The Rev. EDMUND S. JAMES, D.D., *Bishop of M. E. Church, N. Y.*
 The Rev. HENRY J. FOX, D.D., *Charleston, S. C.*
 The Right Rev. W. M. GREEN, D.D., *Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Mississippi.*
 Vice-Chancellor J. GORGAS, *University of the South, Tennessee.*
 The Right Rev. G. T. BEDELL, D.D., *Assistant Bishop of Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Ohio.*
 The Right Rev. G. D. CUMMINS, D.D., *Assistant Bishop of Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Kentucky.*
 The Rev. C. S. FINNEY, D.D., *President of Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.*
 The Rev. T. A. MORRIS, D.D., *Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Springfield, Ohio.*
 The Rev. J. H. McILVAINE, D.D., *Newark, N. J.*
 The Rev. M. SIMPSON, D.D., *Bishop of the M. E. Church, Philadelphia.*
 The Rev. J. BLANCHARD, D.D., *President of Wheaton College, Illinois.*
 Prof. O. N. STODDARD, LL.D., *Wooster University, Ohio.*
 Prof. J. R. W. SLOANE, D.D., *Ref. Pres. Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 The Rev. E. R. CRAVEN, D.D., *Newark, N. J.*
 The Rev. JOSEPH CUMMINS, D.D., LL.D., *President of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.*
 The Rev. STEPHEN H. TYNG, D.D., *New York.*
 The Rev. F. MERRICK, D.D., LL.D., *Pres. of the Ohio University, Delaware, O.*
 The Rev. JOHN B. DALES, D.D., *Philadelphia, Pa.*
 The Rev. JOSEPH T. COOPER, D.D., *Pittsburgh, Pa.*
 The Rev. Dr. J. BANVARD, *Paterson, N. J.*
 The Rev. C. H. EDGAR, D.D., *Easton, Pa.*
 The Rev. JOHN S. STONE, D.D., *Epis. Theo. School, Cambridge, Mass.*
 The Rev. H. DYER, D.D., *Corresponding Sec. of Evangelical Knowledge Society, New York.*
 The Rev. THOMAS SPROULL, D.D., *Ref. Pres. Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. W. F. KING, D.D., *Cornell College, Iowa.*
 Pres. JAMES W. STRONG, D.D., *Carleton College, Minn.*
 Pres. THOMAS HOLMES, D.D., *Union Christian College.*

GENERAL SECRETARY:

- The Rev. D. McALLISTER, *245 West Forty-ninth Street, New York.*

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY:

- The Rev. T. P. STEVENSON, *104 North Sixth Street, Phila.*

RECORDING SECRETARY:

- The Rev. W. W. BARR, *Philadelphia.*

TREASURER:

- SAMUEL AGNEW, Esq., *1126 Arch Street, Philadelphia.*

THE FOLLOWING GENTLEMEN CONCUR IN THE FOREGOING CALL:

His Excellency, ROBERT W. FURNAS, *Governor of Nebraska.*
 The Hon. EDGAR W. HILLYER, *U. S. District Court of Nevada.*
 The Hon. B. F. SAFFOLD, *Supreme Court of Alabama.*
 The Hon. C. C. COLE, LL.D., *Supreme Court of Iowa.*
 The Hon. JAMES PHELPS, *Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut.*
 The Hon. GEO. W. FRENCH, *Chief Justice Supreme Court of Dakota.*
 The Hon. DAVID NOGGLES, *Chief Justice Supreme Court of Idaho.*
 The Hon. MADISON E. HOLLISTER, *Supreme Court of Idaho.*
 The Hon. ROGER S. GREENE, *Supreme Court of Washington Territory.*
 The Hon. HEZEKIAH S. JOHNSON, *Supreme Court of New Mexico.*
 The Hon. J. W. KINGMAN, *Supreme Court of Wyoming Territory.*
 The Hon. C. M. HAWLEY, *Late Justice Supreme Court of Utah.*
 The Hon. SAMUEL S. FISHER, *Cincinnati, Ohio.*
 The Rt. Rev. WM. INGRAHAM KIP, D.D., *Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of California.*
 Pres. DAVID H. COCHRAN, Ph. D., LL.D., *Collegiate and Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.*
 The Rev. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D., *Presb. Sem. of Northwest, Chicago, Ills.*
 Prof. E. KIRBY SMITH, *University of Nashville, Tenn.*
 The Rev. GEO. B. CHEEVER, D.D., *Englewood, N. Y.*
 Prof. W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., *Princeton Theo. Sem., N. Y.*
 The Rev. EDWIN B. WEBB, *Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston, Mass.*
 President J. F. COOK, LL.D., *La Grange College, Mo.*
 Chancellor ALEX. WINCHELL, LL.D., *Syracuse University, N. Y.*
 The Rev. DORUS CLARKE, D.D., *Boston, Mass.*
 Pres. SOLOMON POOL, D.D., *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.*
 Pres. WALTER HILLMAN, LL.D., *Central Female Institute, Miss.*
 Prof. EDMUND H. BENNETT, LL.D., *Boston University, Mass.*
 The Rev. R. BETHELL CLAXTON, D.D., *Divinity School, P. E. Church, West Phila.,*
 Pres. A. J. MCGLUMPHY, D.D., *Lincoln University, Illinois.*
 The Rev. B. P. AYDELOTT, D.D., *Cincinnati, Ohio.*
 S. H. FORD, LL.D., *Ed. Christian Repository, St. Louis, Mo.*
 Pres. L. H. HAMMOND, *Lebanon Valley College, Pa.*
 Pres. REUBEN ANDRUS, D.D., *Indiana Asbury University, Ind.*
 Pres. A. B. MILLER, D.D., *Waynesburg College, Pa.*
 Pres. CYRUS NUTT, D.D., LL.D., *Indiana State University, Ind.*
 The Rev. A. A. HODGE, D.D., *Western Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. GEORGE P. HAYS, D.D., *Washington and Jefferson College, Pa.*
 Pres. DANIEL RICE, D.D., *Logansport Female College, Ind.*
 The Rev. M. W. JACOBUS, D.D., *Western Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. P. M. BARTLETT, D.D., *Marysville College, Tenn.*
 Pres. DAVID A. WALLACE, D.D., *Monmouth College, Ills.*
 Pres. MILTON VALENTINE, D.D., *Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.*
 The Rev. S. J. WILSON, D.D., *Western Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. O. L. SMITH, D.D., *Emory College, Georgia.*
 The Rev. G. W. W. STONE, A.M., *Emory College, Ga.*
 The Rev. I. S. HOPKINS, A.M., M.D., *Emory College, Ga.*

The Rev. MORGAN CALLOWAY, D.D., *Emory College, Ga.*
 The Rev. DAVID R. KERR, D.D., *U. P. Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. GEO. WOODS, D.D., *Western University, Pittsburgh, Pa.*
 The Rev. W. D. HOWARD, D.D., *Allegheny, Pa.*
 The Rev. A. D. CLARK, D.D., *U. P. Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 The Rev. WM. PRESTON, D.D., *Pittsburgh, Pa.*
 The Rev. GEORGE HILL, D.D., *Blairsville, Pa.*
 The Rev. JAMES BROWN, D.D., *Keokuk, Iowa.*
 The Hon. LEVI COFFIN, *Cincinnati, O.*
 The Rev. S. MEASE, *Ed. Christian World, Cincinnati, Ohio.*
 The Rev. B. F. BROOKE, D.D., *Allegheny, Pa.*
 The Rev. A. RITCHIE, *Sec. of Western Tract and Book Society, Cincinnati, Ohio.*
 The Rev. S. F. SCOVEL, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*
 The Rev. S. O. WYLIE, D.D., *Philadelphia, Pa.*
 The Rev. A. KINGSBURY, D.D., *Putnam, Ohio.*
 The Rev. ROBT. DICKSON, D.D., *New Albany, Ind.*
 The Rev. D. W. FRENCH, D.D., *Mercer, Pa.*
 The Rev. W. M. GRIMES, D.D., *Cadiz, Ohio.*
 The Rev. WM. FINDLEY, D.D., *New Wilmington, Pa.*
 The Rev. J. B. JOHNSTON, D.D., *St. Clairsville, Ohio.*
 The Rev. SAMUEL FLEMING, LL.D., *Crown Point, Ind.*
 The Rev. H. MILLER, D.D., *Monongahela City, Pa.*
 The Rev. DAVID COOK PAGE, D.D., *Pittsburgh, Pa.*
 The Rev. THOS. CRUMPTON, D.D., "
 The Rev. H. W. SPAULDING, D.D., "
 The Rev. R. W. PEARSON, D.D., "
 The Hon. T. H. BAIRD PATTERSON, "
 The Rev. W. J. REID, "
 The Rev. T. H. HANNA, "
 The Rev. W. H. KNOX, "
 The Rev. J. W. WITHERSPOON, "
 The Rev. J. W. BAIN, "
 The Rev. SAMUEL LAIRD, "
 The Rev. S. M. VERNON, "
 The Rev. I. J. BARKLEY, "
 R. E. STEWART, Esq., "
 R. B. CARNAHAN, Esq., "
 ROBERT WOODS, Esq., "
 THOS. H. RABE, Esq., "
 A. M. BROWN, Esq., "
 THOS. MABON, M.D., "
 G. S. SPRECHER, M.D., "
 WM. FLOYD, Esq., "
 S. M. KIER, Esq., "
 JOSEPH DILWORTH, Esq., "
 JOHN FLOYD, Esq., "
 SAMUEL REA, Esq., "

AND NUMEROUS OTHERS.

The Chairman then announced the following Committees:

ON ENROLLMENT.—Rev. H. H. George, Rev. J. W. Bain, Rev. D. F. Bonner, D. Chestnut, Esq., Rev. D. Gregg, Rev. G. K. Ormond, W. T. Miller, Esq., Rev. Nevins Woodside, Rev. H. Miller, D. D.

ON PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.—Rev. M. Kieffer, D. D., Thomas H. Rabe, Esq., Rev. J. L. McCartney, Rev. J. B. Johnston, D. D., Rev. A. M. Milligan, D. D., Rev. H. W. Spaulding, D. D., A. M. Brown, Esq., S. A. Sterrett, M. D., Rev. W. J. Reid, Rev. D. B. Willson, Rev. W. H. French.

Pending the report of the Committee on Permanent Organization, the Chairman introduced the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, D. D., of Philadelphia, Corresponding Secretary of the National Association, who addressed the Convention on

THE ENDS WE SEEK.

ADDRESS OF REV. T. P. STEVENSON, CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

It devolves on me to preface the discussions and deliberations of this Convention with a brief statement of the nature and object of this movement.

It is well to say, though it be for the thousandth time, that we seek no union of Church and State. Not only do the promoters of the movement unanimously disclaim any such design, but it is never to be expected as a legitimate fruit of their work. The principle of this movement is, that the nation should acknowledge and serve God for itself, and not through the medium of any church establishment. The true relations of Church and State are prescribed by God, who is the author of them both. If both obey His law they can no more come into improper relations with each other than two planets can come into collision while both obey the law which binds them to one center. Why do any of you, my friends, deprecate a union of Church and State? The highest answer which can be given, and the one which includes all others, is that such an arrangement is contrary to the will of God. What then have you to fear from a movement whose sole aim is to lead the nation to acknowledge its obligation to the will of God? But if the relations of Church and State are left to be determined by shallow considerations of expediency, or by political intrigue, we have everything to fear. Through the immense largesses it receives from corrupt politicians, the Roman Catholic Church is, practically, the established church of the city of New York. These favors are granted under the guise of a seeming friendliness to religion. We propose to put the substance for the shadow, to drive out the counterfeit by the completer substitution of the true.

Further, what we propose is nothing of a sectarian character. It will give no branch of American Christians any advantage over any other. Its advocates are gathered from all branches of the church, not excluding those who prefer to be called "Liberal" rather than Evangelical, from whose ranks some of its ablest supporters have come.

I. I strike a responsive chord in every heart before me when I say that, first of all our movement aims to preserve the Christian institutions which have descended to us from our fathers. It is the settled policy of the enemies of Christianity to deny the fact, and to disparage the importance, of any connection which exists between the American government and the Christian religion. It is worth while to look for a moment at the proofs of such connection.

Nothing but the teachings of Christianity makes any distinction between the first day of the week and other days. Yet that day is distinguished from all others by the statutes of every State in the American union, with only a single exception. Contracts made on that day are void. Legal processes cannot, on that day, be issued or returned. Trade and labor on that day are restrained by law. For all secular purposes it is a *dies non*, in the eye of the law. This is a fact of immense moral and religious value. No man can estimate the advantage to religion and the public morals from our civil Sabbath. No man who has not studied carefully the condition of countries where no Sabbath exists can forecast the evils of that day—whose coming may God forefend—when these restraints shall be lifted away; when the sharp competition of trade shall incite to unremitting labor and traffic; when the avenues of employment shall be more and more closed against Sabbath-keeping men, and the keen temptations of such a state of affairs shall seduce our sons and daughters to disregard the day of rest.

The nation has from the beginning maintained public acts of civil worship in accordance with the Christian religion. The national Congress and all the State Legislatures are regularly opened with prayer. No Constitutional Convention, so far as known, has ever failed to invoke divine assistance by prayer, with the unfortunate exception of the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States. Public Fasts and Thanksgivings are proclaimed by our state and national Executives. It is a very shallow view of the significance of these observances, which would say either that they are unmeaning forms, expressive of no sentiment in the heart of the nation, or that the nation worships by these acts some vague, uncertain power, and not the God of the Christian Scriptures.

Further, Public instruction in the Christian religion has always been maintained by the nation for all classes under its care. Three classes, at least, of the population are thus cared for. The first is a very large class, almost half of the whole people—the children of our schools, numbering fourteen millions and taught by two hundred and twenty thousand teachers. In all these schools, except where infidelity and Romanism have prevailed to cast the Bible out, the Christian Scriptures are read daily as the Word of God. Our text books are largely filled with selections from Christian literature. Christian morality is inculcated in the schools. He knows little of the workings of the human heart who disparages the importance of the impression thus made on the children of the republic. The men in our army and navy, and those under restraint in our jails and houses of correction, for all of whom Christian chaplains are provided by the government, are the other classes to whom I refer.

To these considerations I might add that the Christian law of marriage and divorce underlies our legislation on the social relations; that the names of God and Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are guarded against blasphemy by our laws; that the oath, usually in some Christian form, is employed in all our courts of justice, and in all departments of the Government. These facts prove that the American Government was founded by the people as the organ through which the nation might enforce Christian morality in all its borders; might call on its God in the day of peril or distress, and give him thanks in the hour of prosperity, and might teach the name and the fear of God to its future citizens.

But there is not one of these Christian features of our civil institutions that is not the object of persistent and determined assault at this hour. The following "Demands of Liberalism" are the programme of the Liberal leagues now forming in many parts of the country:

1. We demand that churches and other ecclesiastical property shall no longer be exempt from just taxation.

2. We demand that the employment of chaplains in Congress, in State Legislatures, in the navy and militia, and in prisons, asylums, and all other institutions supported by public money, shall be discontinued.

3. We demand that all public appropriations for educational and charitable institutions of a sectarian character shall cease.

To this demand the advocates of the Religious Amendment offer no objection.

4. We demand that all religious services now sustained by the government shall be abolished; and especially that the use of the Bible in the public schools, whether ostensibly as a text-book or avowedly as a book of religious worship, shall be prohibited.

5. We demand that the appointment, by the President of the United States or by the Governors of the various States, of all religious festivals and fasts shall wholly cease.

6. We demand that the judicial oath in the courts and in all other departments of the government shall be abolished, and that simple affirmation under the pains and penalties of perjury shall be established in its stead.

7. We demand that all laws directly or indirectly enforcing the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath shall be repealed.

8. We demand that all laws looking to the enforcement of "Christian" morality shall be abrogated, and that all laws shall be conformed to the requirements of natural morality, equal rights, and impartial liberty.

9. We demand that not only in the Constitution of the United States and of the several States, but also in the practical administration of the same, no privilege or advantage shall be conceded to Christianity or any other special religion; that our entire political system shall be founded and administered on a purely secular basis; and that whatever changes shall prove necessary to this end shall be consistently, unflinchingly, and promptly made.

The intelligent and consistent infidels who make these demands are not the whole army now moving to the assault on our Christian institutions. Every open violator of the Sabbath is to be counted in their ranks. Every railroad corporation that runs its trains on the Sabbath is a part of their forces. Every Sunday paper is an organ of this crusade on our Christian institutions. Every man who opposes the Bible in the schools is enlisted under the same banner. The whole Roman Catholic Church joins in their movement, through its hostility to the Bible in the hands of the people. And last of all, they are re-inforced by a great multitude of Christians who are willing to surrender everything for the sake of peace. Let no one say, There is no danger of their success. They are succeeding. Our Sabbath laws and laws against blasphemy are fast becoming a dead letter on our statute books. Our divorce legislation, in many States, is a reproach to the Christian name. In St. Louis and other places the Bible has been already excluded from the schools. The legality of the resolution of the Cincinnati School Board, prohibiting prayer and the reading of the Scriptures, has recently been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the State. They are succeeding everywhere, and where are Christian people aroused and united to withstand them? Is there not need of a standard around which we may rally the friends of our Christian institutions? of some wise, comprehensive, efficacious measure in the advocacy of which we may combine all Christian people and inspire them with the enthusiasm which foretakens success? Such a measure, we propose. It is the only movement to-day which directly antagonizes the infidel assaults on the Christian features of our government.

But is this the wisest form of resistance? I answer:

1. It offers resistance at the very point of assault, and this is a point of great

strategic value. The appeal of the enemy is to the Constitution. The New York council of Political Reform has just published a report on compulsory education, which says in substance: "The government cannot give instruction in religion, because it has no religion. To protect all religions and to favor none, is the organic law of the United States." Mr. Abbot enforces the "demands of liberalism" by appealing to a Constitution which he declares is "untainted with superstition." They demand that all Christian usages and institutions be abrogated to conform to the Constitution. We propose, since the silence of the Constitution is thus interpreted, to amend it to conform to the actual character of the nation.

2. The nature of a written Constitution requires such acknowledgements as we propose. All the great authorities on constitutional law maintain that the perfection of a written Constitution consists in its accuracy as a transcription of the unwritten or vital constitution of the nation. The Constitution of the United States is the charter of our national government. It ought to cover and authenticate all acts of the government. It ought to express truly the actual character of the nation. Otherwise there is danger that what is not so protected will be regarded as unconstitutional, and the Constitution be used to overturn what it is its high office to conserve.

Our hopes, too, look beyond the mere maintenance of our Christian institutions as they are. We must do more than merely arrest the current which is bearing us away from God and religion. We must begin to make progress in the opposite direction. The success of our movement will be the introduction of a springing and germinating principle into the Constitution, which will yet redeem American politics from all unholy influences, and enable us to attain to a complete and consistent Christian character as a nation.

II. We aim by this amendment to put the nation right before the world. The honored ex-President of a New England college, and author of an esteemed work on "International Law," recently stood before the representatives of Christendom assembled in conference in the city of New York, and summed up his formal discussion of the relation of Constitution and government in the United States to Christianity, by saying that in this country "Christianity has as little to do with the law and the law with Christianity as possible." A distinguished American divine now residing in Berlin has written a book with the avowed purpose of instructing European statesmen in the relations of "Church and State in America." These relations he makes to consist in the entire divorce of the government from Christianity, even denying that axiom of American jurisprudence that the Christian religion is part of our common law. These misrepresentations are of ancient date. In 1796 a treaty was contracted with the Bey of Tripoli in which it was declared that "the government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion, and has, in itself, no character of enmity against the laws and religion of Mussulmans." This, in face of the fact that a Mussulman coming to this country and setting up a harem would be consigned, in any of our States, to the penitentiary. This, in view of the fact that he would be compelled to abstain from open desecration of the Christian Sabbath, and that his children would be daily taught in the schools to revere the Bible as the word of God and to disbelieve in the Koran! This flagrant falsehood, as I make bold to call it, could never have been uttered, had our Constitution from the first contained the acknowledgments which we seek.

American institutions are studied with increasing attention in Europe. But they study mainly the National Constitution—not the laws of the States. The relation of

our Government to the Christian religion is not indicated in that instrument, and thus we are misrepresented to the world. Christian men in Europe fear republican ideas, because they are connected in their minds with the abandonment of national religion. We owe it to God and the Christian faith, we owe it to the cause of popular government, to disabuse their minds of this impression.

III. Finally, we seek through this Amendment to render due homage to Almighty God, to Jesus Christ, the Ruler of nations, and to the law he has revealed for our guidance. If this Amendment is necessary to preserve our Christian institutions, it is then a supreme duty to God. If it is necessary to indicate to the world our Christian character, let us beware lest we fall under the censure of those who refuse to confess Christ before men. Is the Almighty God our Ruler? If he is, let us acknowledge him. Is Jesus Christ the providential ruler of the world, the dispenser of our blessings and chastisements, and able to save and to destroy? Gratitude and prudence combine to induce us to acknowledge him. Is the Bible supreme law for nations? Let us enthroned it where no man who professes loyalty to American institutions will be able to scoff at its authority.

These, fellow-citizens, are the ends we seek. We affirm that they are patriotic and laudable, and we propose to pursue them in a lawful way.

The Committee on Permanent Organization presented a partial report, which was afterwards supplemented by additional names. In its full form, the report is as follows:

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE CONVENTION.—The Hon. Felix R. Brunot.

VICE PRESIDENTS.—Prof. A. A. Hodge, D.D., Hon. T. H. B. Patterson, Gen. T. F. Gallagher, Prof. Neal, Rev. M. Kieffer, D.D., L. Johnson and J. D. Baldwin, M.D., *Pennsylvania*; Rev. J. P. Sankey, Rev. D. F. Bonner, Rev. J. F. Walsh, D.D., *New York*; Rev. J. B. Johnston, D.D., J. Graph, Esq., Rev. G. L. Kalb, Henry Martin, Esq., *Ohio*; Rev. William, Johnston, *Indiana*; J. M. Sloane, Esq., W. T. McAdams, *Illinois*; Rev. R. A. McAyeal, *Iowa*; Rev. Randall Ross, Rev. J. McCracken, *Missouri*; Rev. J. S. T. Milligan, *Kansas*; Rev. R. B. Cannon, D.D., *Wisconsin*; C. A. Dunbar, Esq., Rev. J. R. Hill, *Michigan*; Rev. D. C. Faris, *Vermont*; Rev. D. McFall, *Massachusetts*; Rev. J. Lynd, *Maryland*; G. M. Elliott, *Virginia*; J. H. Stevenson, Rev. M. M. Marling, *West Virginia*; Rev. R. D. Spinell, *North Carolina*; G. B. Magee, *South Carolina*; Joseph Bowes, Esq., *Florida*.

SECRETARY.—Rev. D. R. Kerr, D.D.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—Rev. W. S. Owens.

After the loud and long continued applause which followed the announcement of the name of the President had subsided, and the vote had been taken, Dr. Sloane yielded the chair to Mr. Brunot, who spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF FELIX R. BRUNOT,

PRESIDENT OF THE CONVENTION.

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION:—As I cast my thoughts back over the short period of time which has elapsed since the organization of the National Association for the Religious Amendment to the Constitution, recalling the events of its life, and

as I count the long list of the names of distinguished men who have signed the call for the Convention, I feel that our cause has made the progress of twenty years in five. And, as with this conviction, I stand in the presence of this grand assemblage of earnest men, there is one thought which, above all others, fills my soul, and first of all demands expression. It is that of gratitude to Almighty God that he has so abundantly blessed the efforts of our Association. To him be the glory! To us, the duty to go forward with the work he has given us to do, and upon which he smiles. Let us address ourselves to the duty, so far as we may, in a spirit and manner worthy of our cause.

The publications of the National Association and the call which has been read, clearly set forth the objects of its organization. This convention, constituted of delegates duly appointed by branches of the Association and other friendly bodies from many and distant parts of our country, has assembled to promote these objects.

We do this by advancing such arguments in favor of our position as may tend to convince others; by confuting the arguments which have been advanced in opposition, by correcting misunderstandings and misrepresentations, and by devising such measures as may be deemed best to win public opinion to right action, and lead to an amendment of the Constitution necessary to conform it to the religious convictions of the people, and which we believe to be essential for the preservation of religious and civil liberty.

"It is sweet and glorious to die for one's country," said the heathen poet. The sentiment never fell upon the ear of a patriot without reaching sympathy in his heart; but how much sweeter, how infinitely more glorious to live for one's country! This is the sentiment which, next after the still higher one of fealty to our Divine master and benefactor, has prompted the movement and inspires the soul of this assemblage.

The chief arguments against the Association are aimed, not at its real principles and purposes, which have been enunciated over and over again, but, against supposititious evil motives and designs. Men have set up a horror of their own imagining to be demolished, and when demolished to their own satisfaction, fondly think they have done a good and brave thing. If in any case they strike effectively at bigotry, intolerance and tyranny, they have indeed done a good thing, but not against us. These are the enemies against which we fight. They are the enemies of Protestant Christianity, of Christian liberty, of God; and the shafts which our mistaken friends aim at these, touch not our vitals.

We are charged with meaning to "unite Church and State"—with a design to "turn this republic into a Theocracy." That we are "opposed to religious liberty," and that we wish to "trammel men's consciences." One opponent flippantly informs us that we "cannot make men religious by laws"—as if we had any thought to try it. A learned Rabbi declares that "these saintly men" cannot cure the morals in the State and society by "hanging out a new sign board," and an Englishman just landed upon our shores to instruct the people, talks ignorantly about "some who had arisen asking that the State should enact the existence of a God," as if he thought a law of man would make a God. Those objectors profess to represent classes of our opponents. Let me try to convince them that they misunderstand us.

We propose "such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States (or its preamble) as will suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the author of the nation's existence and the ultimate source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its Ruler, and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct, and thus indicate that this is a

Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

The Fourth Article of the Constitution declares that "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," and the first amendment in the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." We have not proposed to change these. We deem them essential in connection with the amendment we ask, to the preservation of religious liberty, and with it, an effective guard against "a union of Church and State."

A free state is constituted, under God for the purpose of securing to men the right to pursue health, wealth, and happiness, and freely to be protected in their enjoyment. The protection of the concomitants of these is essential to their enjoyment, and is secured by laws and penalties enforced by a magistracy instituted by common consent. The civil law of the State has to do with the acts of men, and its penalties concern their bodies; it has nothing to do with their souls. Religion, on the other hand, is a matter of the soul, of conscience, of faith. You cannot make one believe by a penalty upon his body. A man cannot make himself believe in a particular religion on account of bodily penalties. His religion must be a matter of inward conviction produced by reason. The State controls men's actions for the good and safety of society by acting from without. The Church controls men's acts for the salvation of their souls by acting from within. Their functions and modes of operation are separate and distinct; hence no State can rightly attempt to compel the consciences of its citizens with a particular religion, and, as we believe, no particular religion can rightly attempt to use the State to compel men's consciences to its belief. This principle is an essential element of Protestant Christianity. Its converse is essentially the opponent of Christianity, and the concomitant of all other existing forms of religion.

It is to this principle the American Israelite, infidel, materialist, pantheist, or pagan, in common with Christian sects, owe, untrammelled, the right of conscience, and not as the first named mistakenly imagine, to the irreligious character of the Constitution. They were as free in conscience, and equal before the law, under the Constitution of 1787, and they will be none the less so under the amendment we propose.

Up to the Christian era no nation permitted freedom of conscience in religion. The government of the Israelites was a theocracy. The laws came directly from God, and they were suited to the people. Of all the historic heathen nations, the Grecians—the model people of the advocates of "natural morality"—came nearest to the enjoyment of civil liberty. Yet Socrates, the greatest and best man in all their annals, was arraigned, condemned and executed on a charge of "violating the laws in not acknowledging the gods which the State proclaimed, and introducing new divinities."

What was true before Christianity, has been the rule of heathen nations ever since, and states dominated by a single Christian sect, as Russia, Italy, Greece, Spain, and sometimes even Britain, have too often followed their example. Where states undertake by statute laws to compel men's consciences in their relation to God, there is a condition of affairs indicated as a "union of Church and State." Such a union from our standpoint of Protestant Christianity is unscriptural and absurd. Our religion appeals to men's hearts to affect men's conduct. Its function is to work from within, outwardly. No human law can make a man religious, or a Christian; and no one knows this so well as the Christian.

That first drop which followed the spear point of the Roman soldier from the Master's side, has been swelled, as it flowed down through the long period of eighteen centuries, into a mighty stream by the blood of Christian martyrs shed in testimony of the right of every man to "worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience." The attempt to destroy the inalienable right of freedom of conscience in religion in this our favored land, would meet with its very first organized resistance from this association.

To Christianity, and to Christianity alone, is the world of the nineteenth century indebted for religious liberty. Destroy this, and you destroy Christianity—destroy Christianity, and you destroy religious liberty. God forbid that any under our banner should desire this, and God forgive and enlighten those who charge us with intending such a crime.

No nation ever existed without a religion, and the religion of our nation is Christianity. Her laws are founded on the principles of Christian morality as contradistinguished from natural morality, revealed religion as the opposite of natural religion. The ultimate written source from which their principles are derived is the Bible. The written laws and common law are in accordance with the religion of the people. They are Christians and we have no other laws, save the Constitution, the supreme law, which stands as the infallible test and rule of construction.

In Great Britain the Bible is the law which stands behind all other laws. Chitty says, in notes to Vattel, "In cases of doubt, it is now an admitted rule among all European nations, that our common religion, Christianity, pointing out the principles of natural justice, should be equally appealed to and observed by all as an unfailing rule of construction."

It is not so here. In the United States there is no ultimate appeal but the Constitution. The laws must agree with the Constitution, and being contested, they have no binding authority in the courts, unless they so agree. Our Christian laws, institutions and usages have no legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.

The advocates and the opponents of the religious amendment of the Constitution have both from their opposite starting points proved beyond the possibility of refutation that ours is a Christian nation. In like manner, both the friends and opposers of the amendment have proved incontestably, that the Constitution of the United States is not Christian; that, as ex-President Woolsey says, it is as well adapted to a Mohammedan as a Christian nation. Our nation is Christian—the Constitution is unchristian; God exists—Jesus Christ exists—Christianity exists—the Bible, the divine attestation of these facts, exists; the nation believes in them, and its laws, institutions and usages are founded upon these facts. But the Constitution stands behind, godless and repugnant to them all! Can this anomaly continue? Impossible! One by one your Christian laws ordaining the Sabbath, protecting Christian worship, your judicial oath with its appeal to Almighty God, your Christian laws of marriage, and the Christian usages of the nation, the Bible as a teacher of Christian morality in the schools—national prayers or thanksgivings—religious ministry to the army and navy—prayers in Congress—and all the Christian features of State Constitutions, must come to the test of the Constitution of the United States; and they must fall before it.

We demand the abolition of these things, is the cry of the self-styled "Liberal League," the brotherhood of infidels, rationalists, spiritualists, free thinkers, and communists. They demand that the civil policy of the nation, its judicial system, its religious practices, its Christianity, shall be secularized to conform to the Constitution!

We propose—not demand—that the Constitution shall be made to conform to the Christian character of the nation. "Let it simply be asked," said Washington, "where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?" Let us pursue the thought and further ask, where is the security for religious liberty, and the rights of conscience, if the Christian idea be abolished from the laws of the land?

God, Religion, and Liberty in the Constitution—or, God, Religion, and Liberty eliminated from the laws of the land—are the alternatives presented. Which will the people choose?

Licentiousness and tyranny are the enemies and antipodes of religion. Nor is piety by any means essential to the appreciation of a fact so readily proved from history. Said the great and wise patriot I have quoted: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. * * * The mere politician equally with the pious man ought to respect and cherish them. * * * Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

If the Bible is true, we must believe that the State is a divine institution for the good of man, and that the governments of earth are dependent on the government of Heaven for their prosperity. History and prophecy alike testify to God's absolute dominion. "For there is no power but of God." The Bible and history, analogy and reason, and the corroborative testimony of the great writers on national jurisprudence, affirm the moral personality of the State. In its capacity as a personality responsible to God, the State governs under His authority, deprecates his wrath, or invokes his aid, and is answerable to him for its acts. As private distress brings individual men to feel their dependence, so also, national calamity humbles the State before its Supreme Ruler.

There are many patriots and Christians who have, as yet, given no thought to the subject in these aspects. If it had fallen to the duty of the people in some dark period of the civil war to form a Constitution and erect the State, these men would have been to the front and the instrument devised would have been all glowing with God—the acknowledgment of his divine sovereignty, man's dependence upon his power and invocation for his gracious protection and guidance. Let us not deceive ourselves. God is sovereign still, and calls upon the nation by his blessings and benefactions for the acknowledgment which it dared not deny under the pressure of his just punishment.

"I respect this movement very sincerely," said the editor of the *Index*, one of the ablest and fairest leaders of the Infidel wing of our opponents, * * * "and if I were a Christian, if I believed in Christianity, I do not see how I could help taking my stand at your side." Deny, if you choose, the personality and moral responsibility of the State, and accept the shallow thoughts of those who liken the Constitution to a "sign-board," or to "a town charter," and the State to "a railroad corporation," or to "a counting house;" be oblivious to every argument by which the friends of the Religious Amendment have proved the paramount importance and wisdom of the measure;—there still remains the instinct of fealty to Almighty God, and to the Saviour, which, it seems to me, must inevitably draw all Christian minds to its support.

Rev. W. S. Owens, Assistant Secretary, then read the following letters, selected from a large number from absent friends of the movement:

LETTERS FROM ABSENT FRIENDS.

From Prof. J. H. Seelye, D. D., Amherst College, Massachusetts.

AMHERST COLLEGE, *January 16, 1874.*

REV. D. McALLISTER.—*Dear Sir:*—Yours of yesterday is received. No urging on the part of others that I should attend the Pittsburgh Convention can exceed the impulse of my own desire to be there. But I cannot do it without failing in some engagements for other work from which I cannot be free, and I must, therefore, be content to stay away. But no pressure of other duties shall prevent my sympathy with the purposed meeting or my prayer that a Divine blessing may attend it. The only time I ever doubted the propriety of the Religious Amendment was before I gave it any thought. Since then, with increasing reflection, the conviction has also grown that this amendment is demanded alike by our past history and our present necessities, and that it may claim and ought to receive the favor of every Christian and patriot in our land. I pray that the movement in its behalf may continue to gather increasing volume.

Very truly yours, J. H. SEELYE.

From Dr. Stephen H. Tyng, New York.

ST. GEORGE'S RECTORY, NEW YORK, *January 8, 1874.*

MY DEAR SIR:—My health and my absolute occupations, both forbid my undertaking the journey or the duty you propose. It is all that I can do to be about my Master's business in my daily appointed walk and obligation. I sincerely wish the triumph of the purpose and the plan which you so earnestly and intelligently support. But I can do but little now. Your friend and brother in our Lord,

STEPHEN H. TYNG.

REV. D. McALLISTER.

From Prof. Wm. Henry Green, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, N. J.

PRINCETON, *December 11th, 1873.*

REV. D. McALLISTER.—*My Dear Sir:*—I shall feel honored by having my name appended to the "call," whose objects I most heartily approve; and since I have marked the boldness of infidelity in counter claims, I have no scruples as to the advisability of the movement, though I confess I did cherish some at the outset. It is time that, without any narrowness or bigotry, Christians were united in the affirmation that this is and shall be a Christian land, and that the acknowledgment of this truth shall be put beyond all peradventure by being formally recorded in the National Constitution.

Yours, truly,

W. HENRY GREEN.

From the Rt. Rev. J. B. Kerfoot, D.D., Protestant Episcopal Bishop of the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

BISHOP'S HOUSE, 11 CLIFF STREET, PITTSBURGH, *February 3d, 1874.*

REV. D. McALLISTER, GENERAL SECRETARY.—*Rev. and Dear Sir:*—While it will be quite out of my power to attend any meetings, this week, of the National

Convention in behalf of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, I write a line to express my continued and increasingly strong conviction of the need and wisdom of the measure proposed.

I am, very respectfully and truly, Yours,

J. B. KERFOOT.

From the Rev. Joseph Cummings, D.D., LL.D., President of the Wesleyan University, Conn.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, MIDDLETOWN, CONN., Feb. 3, 1874.

REV. D. McALLISTER.—*Dear Sir:* I greatly regret that my engagements will not permit me to attend the Convention called at Pittsburgh to secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. I most heartily approve of the object, and will gladly aid in securing it.

In these times of political corruption and disaster, when it would seem that responsibility to God were forgotten in public life, when the high places of power are used for selfish aims and personal preferment, when the community is startled at defalcations and the frauds of those who should be models of integrity and honor, it would seem eminently fitting that efforts should be made to restore our government to its primitive simplicity and virtue, and to the recognition of God as our source of power, and his Word as our guide in public affairs as well as in the acts of private life.

All Christian patriots must regret that in our excellent Constitution there is the sad omission of the recognition of God as the author of government and the preserver of a true national life, and of his Word as the supreme rule of conduct. This omission was deplored when the Constitution was framed. When remonstrated with in relation to it, Hamilton said, "I declare we forgot it." Various reasons and excuses were given by others, but none of them affirmed that such a recognition would be improper or contrary to the spirit of our institutions.

Many eminent statesmen believed, with Washington, that the government by its wise legislation would secure the advancement of true religion and the completion of our happiness. Such anticipations have not been realized.

We need this recognition of God in the Constitution as a manifest foundation of our claim to be a Christian nation, and for its powerful indirect influence in promoting the great principles of justice, benevolence and righteousness which are founded on the word of God, and which must be regarded with reverence and a sense of personal responsibility by the rulers and people of every nation that would long enjoy prosperity.

From the earliest ages religion has been regarded as the foundation of national prosperity. In Egypt, Palestine and the Oriental nations, religion has been the main object of government. "In Greece it was the only bond of union that held together the several members of that illustrious commonwealth of States."

Plutarch, speaking of the legislators of Greece and Rome, says that religion is the cement of civil union and the essential support of civil government. "A city might as well be built on the air without any earth to stand upon, as a Commonwealth or a kingdom be constituted or founded without religion." Our principles are not novel or fanatical. They are sanctioned by the experience of ages.

Religious men must awake to a sense of their responsibility and of their sin as citizens, in neglecting God.

Amid the strife and corruption of political parties, a new party must arise based on broad religious principles, that disregarding the dictation of self-seeking leaders

and narrow local interests, shall raise us to the high eminence of being a nation whose citizens in public and private fear God and work righteousness.

Yours, truly,

JOSEPH CUMMINGS.

From President Solomon Pool, D. D.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL, January 29th, 1874.

REV. D. McALLISTER, GEN. SEC'Y, &c.—*Dear Sir:*—I regret that I cannot attend the Convention on the 4th prox. The object of the Association must be of great public concern, as it certainly is of highest public importance.

We were born a Christian nation. God gave us our freedom, and upon the great principles of Christian liberty our institutions are founded, and our laws administered. As a nation we are as essentially and distinctively Christian, as is Turkey Mohammedan, or China Pagan. To this we are indebted for our rapid progress and exalted place among the people of the earth. The loftiest destiny which patriots and statesmen claim for us is based upon Christian revelation.

A formal recognition of the great truth upon which our national success and greatness have been founded, now underlies our hope of perpetuity, peace, and prosperity. History bears ample testimony to this fact, and pestilence and war soon drive us to a remembrance of it. Shall we, at this time, forget God's bounty, or refuse to acknowledge his sovereignty?

If there were already in our National Constitution an explicit acknowledgment of God and the Christian religion, would it be wise, prudent, statesmanly, to erase it? Every argument brought to bear against the introduction of such an amendment, as is proposed in the one case, could be urged with equal force in favor of erasing it in the other. To refuse to insert it now is in effect the same as would be the act of expunging it if already existed.

Yours, very respectfully,

SOLOMON POOL.

From the Rev. B. P. Aydelott, D. D. Cincinnati, O.

CINCINNATI, November 24th, 1873.

REV. D. McALLISTER.—*Dear Brother:*—I have been equally surprised and gratified and grateful to the Lord of all hearts at the rapid and abundant success that has accompanied your efforts in the great work of getting such an expression of the sovereign people (under God) as will ere long bring about the desired Christian amendment of the Federal Constitution.

I thank God that my anticipations of your success are so bright; particularly because there is scarcely a probability of my seeing the glorious result. Evidences daily increase upon me that I must soon go hence. I shall, if spared some four or five weeks more, enter upon the eightieth year of my life, and this is the fifty-fourth year of my ministry. God be praised, that he has spared me so unusually long to proclaim the glad tidings of the gospel to a very wicked world.

Yours, in gospel union and sympathy, B. P. AYDELOTT.

From General James A. Ekin, U. S. A.

HEAD-QUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE SOUTH.

LOUISVILLE, KY., January 28th, 1874.

REV. D. McALLISTER.—*My Very Dear Brother:*—If it were at all practicable, I certainly would be with you at the approaching convention in Pittsburgh.

My official engagements are of such a pressing nature, that it will be impossible for me to be absent from the Headquarters of the Division of the South at the time of meeting. I trust that the convention may be a great success. The stream is increasing in volume, and ere long it will sweep everything in its course. How comforting the thought, that the Lord reigneth! Keep up the fire all along the line!

I have the honor to be, very respectfully and sincerely, your friend,

JAMES A. EKin, Brev't Brig. Gen., U. S. A.

From R. G. M'Niece, Esq., Editor Fort Wayne, (Indiana,) Gazette.

FORT WAYNE, January 29, 1874.

REV. D. McALLISTER:—It will be next to impossible for me to attend the meeting at Pittsburgh; but if I were there, I would urge the strongest kind of aggression, on the part of all connected with the convention, against that foreign *secularism* which is attempting to get control of the country, and which would overthrow everything of a Christian character connected with our national institutions. Here in this city, for example, we are ruled in our municipal government, by a lot of drunken, illiterate foreigners, mostly Germans, who are using their utmost endeavors, and pretty successfully, I regret to say, to inaugurate the European Sunday, and make beer and whisky flow like water. Everything of a Christian character, either in Church or State, they deliberately trample under their feet, and act upon the principle that the sacred institutions which have been established in this country for two hundred years should give place to their irreligious European notions. They are laboring continually to secure an entire separation, not between Church and State, which are already separate, and properly so, but between religion and government,—a separation which, in the last analysis, is pure atheism.

The great city of Chicago is now prostrate beneath the feet of this reckless, irreligious class of men, who recognize no God, except Bacchus or Gambrinus, and quote the United States Constitution as authority for such rebellion against the Almighty. Many prominent Americans are becoming tainted and demoralized by such "rational" views, the logical result of which will be a second inauguration of the "Goddess of Reason," as the presiding genius of the American republic.

Hence the necessity of that Reform movement, which would prevent such a catastrophe by rousing the moral sentiment of the better portion of the people until it shall become crystallized in the nation's organic law, thereby putting all Christian legislation on a constitutional basis. All who have had even one year's experience of the peculiar beauties of that government which is administered by those who think God has nothing to do with this world, will be ready like myself, I think, to help forward the good cause of national reform.

Yours, with good wishes, ROBERT G. MCNIECE.

From the Rev. A. A. Miner, D. D., President of Tuft's College, Massachusetts.

BOSTON, MASS., Jan. 29, 1874.

REV. D. McALLISTER.—*Dear Sir:*—I regret that it will be out of my power to attend the approaching Convention at Pittsburgh. No doubt it will prove an important meeting. Every added year illustrates anew the vital importance of Christianity to the progressive life and highest good of a nation. The maintenance of

order, even, among a Christian people, demands Christian life; and order so maintained, is Christian order, based on Christian principles. Now, if the very life-blood of the body politic must be tempered by Christianity, can it be a mistake to confess it? Can there be mischief in acknowledging the source of our strength? Surely, if the fact of the presence of Christianity tempering all our social polity be not an encroachment upon individual rights, the adding of a nominal confession of it cannot be tyrannical, but would be frank and honest. The truth, therefore, lies not with such men as President Woolsey, eminent though they may be, but with either your Convention or those extreme radicals, who would eliminate the last vestige of Christianity from our organic social life. And when it comes to this alternative, even President Woolsey, I think, would be with you.

Accept, my dear Sir, my best wishes for a good issue of your approaching Convention. With great respect, I remain, yours truly, A. A. MINER.

Among the interesting letters from absent friends, particular mention should be made of an address from a number of tourists and residents in Florida, headed by Mr. John Alexander, who has been spending the winter there with his family. In a note to the Corresponding Secretary, Mr. Alexander says: "The list of names might have been indefinitely extended, if I had thought of it sooner, or had time to visit other parts of the State. But I trust it will be deemed appropriate to send up this small voice, as evidence of what may hereafter be heard from this far off portion of the nation." The following resolution was forwarded to the Convention by Mr. Alexander, and the Executive Committee was charged with the duty to which it refers:

Resolved, That this Convention appoint a committee to co-operate with the Centennial Commissioners, in securing in our National Centennial Exposition some suitable recognition of *Christianity*, as the main spring of our National Progress, and the sure hope of our perpetuity and future greatness.

A Committee on Resolutions was then appointed as follows:

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

Rev. J. P. Lytle, Hon. T. H. Baird Patterson, President George P. Hays, D. D., Rev. Randall Ross, Rev. George Hill, D. D., Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D., Rev. J. T. Cooper, D. D., and J. R. W. Baker, Esq.

The President then introduced the General Secretary, the Rev. D. McAllister, who read the following paper:

TESTIMONIES TO THE RELIGIOUS DEFECT OF THE CONSTITUTION.*

BY THE REV. D. M'ALLISTER, GENERAL SECRETARY.

The religious defect of our National Constitution, otherwise so admirable an instrument, is now arresting general attention. On the one hand, the enemies of our Christian institutions of government glory in the fact that the Constitution of the United States contains no acknowledgment of God or the Christian religion; and, on the other hand, Christian citizens, however reluctantly, are constrained to admit the fact.

This defect, of late coming so prominently into public view, has never passed altogether unnoticed. From the formation of the Constitution until the present organized effort to secure its religious amendment, there has been an unbroken chain of testimony to its great defect. To many who have but recently learned with surprise, that our Constitution contains no acknowledgment of God or Christianity, this mass of testimony from some of the ablest thinkers and most patriotic citizens of our country, has been utterly unknown. It may prove interesting and important to gather this array of testimony, scattered through many documents, some of which are accessible to but few, into one complete summary, as a part of the literature of this movement.

Following chronological order, we first meet with the testimony of

LUTHER MARTIN, 1788,

delegate from Maryland to the convention that framed the Constitution. In his letter, dated January 27, 1788, to the Legislature of Maryland, of which State he was Attorney General for thirty years, he says in regard to the exclusion, by the convention, of all reference to God or Christianity from the Constitution:

"There were some members so unfashionable as to think that a belief of the existence of a Deity, and of a state of future rewards and punishments, would be some security for the good conduct of our rulers, and that, in a Christian country, it would be at least decent to hold out some distinction between the professors of Christianity and downright infidelity or paganism."—*Elliott's Debates*, Vol. I., pp. 385, 386.

The testimony of those members referred to has not been preserved. There is no record of their objections in the reported proceedings of the Convention.

* A number of additional testimonies are given in this report, for the sake of completeness. The writer became acquainted with these added testimonies since the Convention met.

MEMBERS OF STATE CONVENTIONS, 1788.

Here again the records of the conventions of the States, held to ratify the Constitution, are defective. But enough is found in the proceedings of some of them to show how sensible were many of their members of its religious defect. Mr. Singletary, Gen'l Brooks, and Colonel Jones in the Massachusetts convention, (*Elliott's Debates*, Vol. II. pp. 44-119,) and Messrs. Caldwell, Abbott, and Lancaster, in the North Carolina convention, (*Ibid.* Vol. IV. pp. 191, 199, 215,) bear similar testimony to that of Luther Martin, and in some instances emphatically call attention to the omission of the name of God from the President's oath.

DR. JOHN RODGERS, 1788.

This eminent chaplain of the Revolution, observing with regret the omission of all acknowledgment of God from the Constitution, inquired of Alexander Hamilton, on his return from the convention in New York, how that body could fail to incorporate in the Constitution a suitable recognition of the Almighty. The well-known reply was, "Indeed, Doctor, we forgot it."—*Duffield's "God of our Fathers,"* p. 15.

FIRST PRESBYTERY EASTWARD IN MASSACHUSETTS AND NEW HAMPSHIRE, 1789.

This body of patriotic citizens, in Newburyport, October 27, 1789, sent an address to George Washington, in which allusion is made to objections that had been urged against the Constitution. It is then added:

"Among these we never considered the want of a religious test, that grand engine of persecution in every tyrant's hand; but we should not have been alone in rejoicing to have seen some explicit acknowledgment of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent, inserted somewhere in the Magna Charta of our country."—*Morris' Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the U. S.* p. 443.

DR. JOHN M. MASON, 1793, 1800.

Next in order among those who have borne public testimony against the religious defect of our National Constitution, is Dr. John M. Mason, that eminent patriot and prince of pulpit orators. In a sermon entitled "Divine Judgments," preached on September 20, 1793, a day set apart in New York for public fasting on account of the yellow fever in Philadelphia, after enumerating manifold and great mercies conferred by God upon us as a nation, he asks: "But where has been our gratitude? What have we rendered to the Lord for His

profusion of benefits?" We ask our readers to weigh well the solemn words with which the eloquent preacher answers his own inquiry:

"Let us appeal to the most interesting, important and solemn business in which we have been engaged since our national existence. One would imagine that no occasion of making a pointed and public acknowledgment of the divine benignity could have presented itself so obviously as the framing of an instrument of government, which, in the nature of things, must be closely allied to our happiness or our ruin, and yet that very Constitution which the singular goodness of God enabled us to establish does not so much as recognize His being! Yes, my brethren, it is a lamentable truth; a truth at the mention of which, shame should crimson our faces, that, like Jeshurun of old, we have waxed fat and kicked. 'Of the Rock that begat us, we have been unmindful; we have forgotten His works, and the wonders that He hath shown us.'"

In a note to this part of the sermon, the writer thus pursues the same subject:

"While many, on various pretenses, have criminated the Federal Constitution one objection has urged itself forcibly on the pious mind. That no notice whatever should be taken of that God who planteth a nation and plucketh it up at His pleasure, is an omission which no pretext whatever can palliate. Had such a momentous business been transacted by Mohammedans, they would have begun, 'In the name of God.' Even the savages whom we despise, setting a better example, would have paid some homage to the Great Spirit. But from the Constitution of the United States, it is impossible to ascertain what God we worship, or whether we own a God at all. It is a very insufficient apology to plead that the devotion which political institutions offer to the Supreme Being is, in most cases, a matter of mere form; for the hypocrisy of one man, or set of men, is surely no excuse for the infidelity of another. Should the citizens of America be as irreligious as her Constitution, we will have reason to tremble, lest the Governor of the universe, who will not be treated with indignity by a people any more than by individuals, overturn from its foundations the fabric we have been rearing, and crush us to atoms in the wreck."—*Works, Vol. III, pp. 52, 53.*

The testimony cited from Dr. Mason's writings would be incomplete, if we failed to quote from his "Voice of Warning." In this stirring discourse, dated September, 1800, and designed to convince Christians of their duty not to vote for irreligious and infidel men for rulers, he remarks:

"The Federal Constitution makes no acknowledgment of that God who gave us our national existence, and saved us from anarchy and internal war. This neglect has excited in many of its best friends more alarm than all other difficulties."—*Works, Vol. IV, p. 570.*

SAMUEL B. WYLIE, D. D., 1803.

This distinguished scholar and divine, widely known from his long and honorable connection with the University of Pennsylvania, in a discourse styled "The Two Sons of Oil," gives the following testimony:

"The Federal Constitution, or instrument of national union, does not even recognize the existence of God, the King of nations. In those civil deeds, though the immediate end may be the happiness of the Commonwealth, yet the ultimate end, as well in this as in every other thing we do, should be the glory of God. Ought not men, in the formation of their deeds, to consider their responsibility to the moral Governor and their obligation to acknowledge his authority? (Prov. iii. 5.) "In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths." That a national deed, employed about the fundamental stipulations of magistracy as an ordinance of God, and the investiture of magistrates as his ministers, should nowhere recognize the existence of the Governor of the universe, is, to say nothing worse of it, truly lamentable. May it not be said of this nation as of Israel, (Hosea viii. 4.) "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not"? Did not the framers of this instrument act not only as if there had been no divine revelation for the supreme standard of their conduct, but also as if there had been no God? Did they not in this resemble the fool mentioned in Psalm xiv. 1, 3, who "said in his heart, There is no God"? Every official act of the governor of a province must have some specific stamp of his dependence upon the authority which appointed him,—and shall a nation act as if independent of the God of the universe, and expect to be guiltless?" (*Pages 34, 35.*)

SAMUEL AUSTIN, D. D., 1811.

This celebrated New England Congregational Divine, afterwards President of the University of Vermont, in a sermon to his congregation at Worcester, Mass., on the occasion of the annual State fast, April 11, 1811, speaks as follows:

"However sagaciously devised and balanced our National Constitution of government may be, in a mere political view, it has one capital defect which will issue inevitably in its destruction. It is entirely disconnected from Christianity. It is not founded on the Christian religion. Not a single word respecting God or religion is to be found in the original Constitution, save that an oath or affirmation is required of officers of government."—*Sermon preached at Worcester, pp. 23, 32.*

THE HON. SAMUEL TAGGART, 1812.

This writer, a Presbyterian minister, represented the Hampshire (Mass.) district for several terms in Congress. In 1812 he was pastor of the Presbyterian church in Coleraine, where, on the public fast, July 23d, he preached two sermons entitled "God's Visitation of Sinful Nations." These sermons were repeated August 29th, in Shelbourne. From the very full and able discussion found in the first of these sermons, only brief extracts can be made. The author says:

"I am constrained, somewhat reluctantly, I confess, to notice a feature in our national government itself, which presents to my view a national evil of great magnitude. I mean its being entirely destitute of every appearance of a feature which can be termed religious. Perhaps there is no one feature in the Constitution of the United States which has been the subject of more numerous encomiums, or more unqualified praise, upon both sides of the Atlantic, than this, 'that it takes no notice

of, and is not at all connected with religion.' In this instance, the United States are exhibiting a new and singular spectacle to the world. A government without a connection with religion of some sort is probably a novelty, a phenomenon which the world has never witnessed before. It is a bold experiment, and one which, I fear, can only issue in national apostasy and national ruin."—*Sermons*, pp. 22, 27.

PRESIDENT TIMOTHY DWIGHT, 1812, 1813.

The next witness whom we cite is Dr. Dwight, the well-known President, in former years, of Yale College. On July 23d, 1812, the public fast-day in Connecticut, in view of the calamities of war, President Dwight, of Yale College, preached a discourse, in two parts, in the college chapel. In the second part, among reasons for grave apprehension, is the following:

"The second of these reasons is, *the sinful character of our nation*. Notwithstanding the prevalence of religion which I have described, the irreligion and the wickedness of our land are such as to furnish a most painful and melancholy prospect to a serious mind. We formed our Constitution without any acknowledgment of God, without any recognition of his mercies to us as a people, of his government, or even of his existence. The convention by which it was formed, never asked, even once, his direction or his blessing upon their labors. Thus we commenced our national existence, under the present system, without God. I wish I could say that a disposition to render him the reverence due to his great name, and the gratitude demanded by his innumerable mercies, had been more public, visible, uniform, and fervent." (Page 46.)

In a volume entitled, "President Dwight's Decisions of Questions discussed by the Senior Class in Yale College, in 1813 and 1814," are many weighty remarks on the question, "Ought religious tests to be required of civil officers?" This question was discussed December 22d, 1813. The language of this testimony is as follows:

"It is highly discreditable to us that we do not acknowledge God in our Constitution. Now, it is remarkable that the grossest nations and individuals, in their public acts and in their declarations, manifestoes, proclamations, etc., always recognize the superintendency of a Supreme Being. Even Napoleon does it. We, however, have neglected to do it. God says, 'They who despise me shall be lightly esteemed;' and we have rendered ourselves liable, as a nation, to his displeasure. The corruption which is now rapidly extending in this country gives reason for apprehension that we are soon to suffer the punishment to which we have exposed ourselves.—*Dwight's Decisions*, pp. 111, 112.

THE REV. CHAUNCEY LEE, 1813.

The same year, May 13th, the Election Sermon, or the sermon at the annual general election in Connecticut, was preached by the Rev. Chauncey Lee, of Colebrook, a man of note, as the preachers of these sermons usually were, and of fine ability. The subject of this discourse is, "The Government of God, the true Source and Standard of Human

Government." The text chosen was Matt. vi. 13, the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer. Near the close of the discourse the preacher said:

"Let it then be received as an axiom in politics; let it be engraven upon our hearts as with the point of a diamond, that *religion is the only sure foundation of a free and happy government*. . . . With this truth blazing before us, can we pause and reflect for a moment, without the mingled emotions of wonder and regret, that that public instrument which guaranties our political rights of freedom and independence—our Constitution of national government, framed by such an august, learned, and able body of men; formally adopted by the solemn resolution of each State; and justly admired and celebrated for its consummate political wisdom, has not the impress of *religion* upon it, not the smallest recognition of the government or the being of God, or of the dependence and accountability of man. Be astonished, O earth! Nothing by which a foreigner might with certainty decide whether we believe in the one true God, or in any God; whether we are a nation of Christians, or—but I forbear. The subject is too delicate to say more, and it is too interesting to have said less. I leave it with this single reflection, whether, *if God be not in the camp, we have not reason to tremble for the ark?*" (*Sermon*, pp. 42, 43.)

THE REV. THOMAS ROBBINS, 1815.

This able clergyman, in a sermon preached at East Windsor, Connecticut, on the national fast appointed by the President and Congress, January 12, 1815, gave utterance to what becomes a wide-spread feeling in every time of national calamity. During the war of 1812, as more recently during the rebellion, the hearts of our people were turned to God. In this sermon by Mr. Robbins, published by particular request, the sins of the nation are confessed:

"In our national capacity we have not acknowledged and served the God of heaven. The great evil of our country, in my view, has been that we have attempted to strike out a new path to national prosperity regardless of all the dictates of experience, and the testimony of the Word of God. We have been not a religious, but a political people. Our government was formed upon the principle of excluding all religious principles and character. The country was universally pleased with this feature of the Constitution, believing that, unlike all other prosperous nations that have ever existed, we should rise to national greatness without any national religion. God is not formally recognized, owned or worshipped. I speak not of individuals, for we doubt not that the Lord Jesus has his church in our land, which has enjoyed the rich blessings of His Holy Spirit. But in our collective national capacity we do not worship the God of heaven, we do not acknowledge his Son, we do not receive His Holy Word. I do not recommend the legal establishment of any particular denomination, but lament that our nation has not adopted some method of professing a humble acknowledgment of the Saviour of men, and of the religion of the Holy Scriptures."—*Sermon*, pp. 18, 19.

DR. JOHN B. ROMEYN, 1815.

A very important testimony to the religious defect of our National Constitution is found in a sermon by Dr. J. B. Romeyn, pastor, in the

early part of this century, of the Cedar street Presbyterian church, New York. The sermon, entitled "The Duty of Americans in the Present Crisis," was preached, like that of Mr. Robbins, on the national fast, January 12, 1815. First among the national sins to which the preacher calls attention, is "the nature of our political Constitution." He then proceeds:

"The particular point to which I refer is its defect in regard to religion. That I may not be misunderstood, I think it proper to state that the people of this country are avowedly a Christian people. . . . As a Christian people, the inhabitants of the United States have the right to regulate their own political compact, and no one can consistently object to such regulation. To no people has God given such an opportunity to govern themselves as he has to us. All our acts, therefore, must be considered the acts of our choice. This is peculiarly the case with the Federal Constitution. The United States adopted it deliberately of their own accord in time of peace, with no foreign power to compel them. Though it be thus the choice of a Christian people, in it are not recognized even the existence and government of God, much less the authority of his revealed Word.

"I dislike and reprobate the modeling of churches by civil power, and the exclusive establishment of any particular denomination. Such establishments, I hope, will never take place in this country; for I consider them a grievous evil. But I do not hesitate to say that propriety, reason, and the Word of God require from us, as a Christian people, two things: 1. The recognition of the existence and providence of God. 2. The acknowledgment of his revealed truth." (*Sermons, Edinb. ed., pp. 477, 480.*)

ALEXANDER M'LEOD, D.D., 1815.

Prominent among these testimonies, in connection with the war of 1812, is that of Dr. Alexander McLeod, pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian church, New York. In 1815 he published a series of sermons on "The Character, Causes, and Ends of the Present War"—an admirable group of patriotic and statesmanlike discussions. In the second sermon of the series he remarks:

"The public immoralities of the Constitution of our Federal government may be classed under two heads, viz., disrespect for God, and violation of human liberty. By the terms of the national compact God is not at all acknowledged, and holding men in slavery is authorized. Both these are evils. No association of men for moral purposes can be justified in an entire neglect of the Sovereign of the world. Statesmen in this country had undoubtedly in their eye the abuse of religion for mere political purposes, which in the nations of the Old World had corrupted the sanctuary and laid the foundation for the persecution of godly men. But no consideration will justify the framers of the Federal Constitution and the administration of the government in withholding a recognition of the Lord and his Anointed from the grand charter of the nation. At our ordinary meals we acknowledge the Lord of the world. We begin our last testament for disposing of worldly estates, 'In the name of God'; and shall we be guiltless, with the Bible in our hands, to disclaim the Christian religion as a body politic?" (*Sermons on the War, pp. 54, 55.*)

DR. GEORGE DUFFIELD, 1819.

December 9th, 1819, was appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania as a day of humiliation, thanksgiving, and prayer. Among the sermons preached on that day, was one entitled, "Judgment and Mercy," in the Presbyterian church of the borough of Carlisle, by the above named clergyman. Mentioning the sins of which the nation was guilty, he said:

"There is one strictly national, that commenced in the adoption of the Federal Constitution, i. e. the want of an acknowledgment in it of a Supreme Being and of a Divine revelation. That all-important engine of our national prosperity is, in form at least, entirely atheistical. Undoubtedly it was a great sin to have forgotten God in such an important national instrument, and not to have acknowledged Him in that which forms the very nerves and sinews of the political body. He had led us through all the perils of the Revolutionary struggle, and had established us in peaceful and plentiful security, and then to have been forgotten in the period of prosperity, certainly demanded His rebuke. Therefore hath the voice of His Providence proclaimed and even still it sounds in our ears: 'I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought. According to their pasture, so were they filled; they were filled, and their heart was exalted; therefore have they forgotten me. Therefore will I be unto them as a lion; as a leopard by the way will I observe them.'"

JAMES R. WILSON, D.D., 1820-1840.

This rarely eloquent divine, at one time Chaplain to the Legislature of New York, has left a number of sermons, published at intervals during a period of twenty years or more, in which testimony similar to that which has already been given is found. His sermon on "The Subjection of Kings and Nations to Messiah," was published in 1820. In this he says:

"In the United States the refusal to acknowledge God has probably been more explicit than it ever was in any other nation. Soon after we had obtained, through the beneficent providence of God, liberation from the dominion of a foreign power; soon after the most eminent displays of Jehovah's goodness to our land, the convention elected to form articles of fundamental law for the Commonwealth, rejected the government of God, and with a degree of ingratitude, perhaps without a parallel, formed a Constitution in which there is not the slightest hint of homage to the God of Heaven.—(Page 32.)

Another sermon, on "Civil Government and the Sabbath," published in 1829, in which the report of the United States Senate on the transportation of mails on the Lord's day is powerfully handled, contains important testimony. Contending that legislators are bound by the law of the Bible, the writer meets an objection:

"But the people, by their Constitution, they tell us, have withheld from them the power of knowing or being governed by the Divine law. This we deny. It is, indeed, to be greatly deplored, and good men do deeply deplore, that there is no

formal recognition of Him who is Prince of the kings of the earth in the Federal Constitution; but the Constitution has nowhere said that this government either shall or may disobey God." (*Page 44.*)

Similar passages may be found in the sermons entitled, "The Written Law," and "Prince Messiah."

PRINCETON REVIEW, 1832.

The report of the Committee of the United States Senate, (1829) in reference to the transportation of mails on the Lord's day, and the consequent increased disregard of that day by the nation, called forth many able articles on the relation of civil government to the Sabbath. Among them is an article in the *Princeton Review*, in which occurs the following passage:

"It is, probably, the regret of all pious men that the Constitution of the United States never recognizes the being or providence of God. How far He will consider this as impious, who can tell? But surely it would have been, at least, prudent to make some acknowledgment of our dependence, and some expression of gratitude for national favors."—*Princeton Review*, Oct. 1832, pp. 519, 520.

JUSTICE STORY, 1833.

This eminent jurist, in his Commentaries on the Constitution, after maintaining that it is both reasonable and just for civil government "to foster and encourage the Christian religion generally, as a matter of sound policy as well as revealed truth," is constrained to state that the National Constitution is so destitute of religious character that it conflicts no more with the belief of the Jew, or even infidel, than with that of the Christian. Or, in the words of Judge Cooley, in his recent edition of Story's Commentaries: "To meddle at all in matters of religion is no part of the business of the general government." Such is the religiously defective character of the Constitution of a great government which, as a matter of sound policy as well as revealed truth, should foster and encourage the Christian religion. No wonder Judge Story further says:

"It yet remains a problem to be solved in human affairs, whether any free government can be permanent where the public worship of God and the support of religion constitute no part of the policy or the duty of the State in any assignable shape. The future experience of Christendom, and chiefly of the American States, must settle this problem, as yet new in the history of the world, abundant as it has been in experiments in the theory of government."—*Story's Commentaries*, Cooley's edition, Vol. II., pp. 605, 606, 609.

THE REV. D. X. JUNKIN, D.D., 1845.

One of the best discussions of some of the principles that underlie civil society, is a treatise by Dr. D. X. Junkin, published in 1845.

Its title is "The Oath a Divine Ordinance, and an Element of the Social Constitution." It is unquestionably the ablest work to be found on the subject. Its author says:

"The oath of the President of the United States [as embodied in the Constitution] could as well be taken by a Pagan or a Mohammedan, as by the Chief Magistrate of a Christian people; it excludes the name of the Supreme Being. Indeed, it is negatively *atheistical*, for no God is appealed to at all. In framing many of our public formularies, greater care seems to have been taken to adapt them to the prejudices of the infidel few, than to the consciences of the Christian millions. In these things the minority, in our country, has hitherto managed to govern the majority. In every oath the name of God should, in obedience to the Divine command, be interposed; and we look upon the designed omission of it as an attempt to exclude from civil affairs Him who is the 'Governor among the nations.'" (Psalm xxii. 28.)—pp. 141, 142.

ALEXANDER H. VINTON, D. D., 1848.

In the election sermon, preached before the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable Council, and the Legislature of Massachusetts, Jan. 5, 1848, Dr. Vinton states that our own nation, like France, has chosen the social compact theory of Government. Of this theory he thus speaks:

"Forgetting or slighting the distinction between the source of authority and the power of appointment, the theory of the social compact seemed to alienate religion, and to stand alone, in perfect human sufficiency. It was *negatively* atheistic, and it thus invited the practice of atheism. Now, if there be any such thing as the organic relation of a nation to the great Governor of the world; if God be, in any valid and available sense, the Ruler of nations, this omission to recognize him, or to make much of him, in the essential theory of government, was a perfect, if not a fatal, oversight." "France," he continues, "adopted the principle to the extent of its most ruthless radicalism. The issue of the experiment is sufficiently notorious. Our own nation has made election, likewise, of the same theory, as the basis of its polity, though with a mitigation of its ferocity, and with conservative checks. But the great question is, are these checks sufficient? Is there not the same capacity for mischief in our modified system, as in its simpler forms? And what shall prevent the development of its political evil?"—*The Religious Theory of Civil Government*, pp. 18, 19, 21.

DR. E. D. M'MASTER, 1849, 1856.

The first testimony of this witness, President of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, is found in a masterly discourse delivered on the occasion of the national fast, August 3d, 1849. The preacher said:

"The men who planted the first colonies in this land and laid the foundations of these States, were men who feared God, and even in their political affairs, as in other things, were not ashamed to honor His Son. In the days, too, of our weakness and fear and perplexity, when struggling to throw off a foreign dominion, and to gain a place as an independent nation among the powers of the earth, the fathers of our country made in her name, an explicit, formal, and solemn appeal to God in

the heavens, as the righteous Judge and Governor of nations, to own the justice of her cause and vindicate her rights. He heard and answered; gave victory to our arms, and independence to us as a nation, and peace in all our borders, and great prosperity and blessing to us as a people. But oh! how changed is all the scene since that! In the Constitution, which is the bond of union of these States, under which they have grown up from thirteen to thirty great commonwealths, spread and spreading over the whole continent, and the medium through which so manifold benefits have flowed to us a people, there is not found the name of God, nor any reference, direct or indirect, express or implied, to His law, His providence, or His being, unless it be in the ambiguous term 'I swear' in the prescribed oath of office, and the formal designation of the era of its establishment, as that of 'our Lord.'—(Page 23.)

At a later day, (July 2d, 1856,) in a memorable address before the Literary Societies of Miami University, entitled "The True Life of a Nation," Dr. MacMaster repeated his testimony in these words:

"It is not true that there is made by our nation the entire separation of religion from the State and all political affairs, which is often alleged. But it is true, and it is a matter of just reproach, that in the Constitution of the United States, the organic law of the nation, there is, in direct and express terms, no recognition of the being, the providence, or the law of God."—(Page 24.)

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW, 1851.

Coming on down to the year 1851, we meet with the testimony of the *Mercersburg Review*. In the July number for that year, is an elaborate and exceedingly valuable article, entitled "Our National Religion," in which it is maintained that our government has from the first been in connection with Christianity, notwithstanding the religious defect of the National Constitution. This defect is referred to in the following terms:

"The position taken in the Constitution of the United States may be regarded as not simply neutral, but decidedly negative in its character. . . . It does appear as though, in over-anxiety to forestall any inclination even to the establishment of a national church, all recognitions of religion under any form were studiously avoided. This, we are free to confess, is a remarkable feature in an instrument framed for the government of such a nation, and at such a time. It would indeed seem as though the solemn vow, previously made in a season of trouble, had been wholly forgotten. The contrast, in this respect, between the Declaration of Independence and this Constitution, is humiliating and painful. The appeal made to the King of kings in the former, followed by ten thousand fervent supplications from an afflicted, struggling people, was not unavailing. But we look in vain, in this great charter, in which that Declaration found its happy consummation, for a counterpart to that appeal. How shall this painful incongruity be reconciled!"—(Page 329.)

ROBERT BAIRD, D. D., 1856.

In his well-known and widely circulated work on "Religion in America," first published in 1856, this author, after exculpating the

framers of the Constitution for omitting all formal acknowledgment of Christianity, nevertheless adds these words:

"Should any one, after all, regret that the Constitution does not contain something more explicit on the subject, I cannot but say that I participate in that regret. Sure I am that, had the excellent men who framed the Constitution foreseen the inferences that have been drawn from the omission, they would have recognized, in a proper formula, the existence of God, and the truth and the importance of the Christian religion."—*Religion in America*, p. 242.

PROF. J. H. M'ILVAINE, D.D., 1859.

This writer, Professor of Political Science in the College of New Jersey, in an article in the "Princeton Review," for October, 1859, entitled "A Nation's Right to Worship God," testifies as follows:

"The Constitution of the United States has rigorously abstained from all recognition of or allusion to Christianity, or to the being of a God. What is called the oath of the President elect is presented in these words: 'I do solemnly swear or affirm,' &c., in which the officer elect is left free to swear by nothing at all, and thus to leave out not only all recognition of God, but therein also, the very essence of an oath. The practical effect, whether or not the original object of all this, is the neutrality of the government with respect to all religions, so that no possible governmental influence can be constitutionally exerted for or against any form of religious belief. This absolute neutrality in religion of the Constitution of the United States is admitted and defended by the commentators. Says one of them: 'There are reasons why the introduction of religion would have been unreasonable if not improper. The Constitution was intended exclusively for civil purposes. . . . The purity of religion is best preserved by keeping it separate from government.' For these and other reasons he adds. 'It was impossible to introduce into the Constitution even an expression of gratitude to the Almighty for the formation of the present government.' Such are the views of the commentators upon the Constitution of the United States, in which they manifest a cordial zeal for the purity of religion by keeping it separate from government; but unfortunately they do not inform us what is to preserve the purity of government after it has become sequestered from religion—has thus solemnly excommunicated itself. It were devoutly to be wished that some eminent statish of that school would speak to this point."—(*Princeton Review*, October, 1859: pp. 675-677.)

This brings us up to the period of our great struggle for national life and human right. And now, as in the war of 1812, the moral and religious defect of our Constitution becomes more clearly and widely seen, and more frankly acknowledged. We notice the following prominent testimonies during this period of our history:

DR. GEORGE DUFFIELD, JR., 1861.

On January 4, 1861, the day appointed for fasting and prayer by the President, as the premonitions of the coming political earthquake startled the nation into some sense of its sins, Dr. Duffield, then of

Philadelphia, preached a discourse, "The God of our Fathers," of far more than ordinary historic value. The phrase "national sins," in the President's proclamation, suggested to the preacher the inquiry as to what the sins were. In answering this he says:

"Ye have robbed me, even this whole nation," and as a nation He will hold us responsible for this robbery of his service and honor, just as much as he did Israel, and Babylon, and Persia, and Greece and Rome. To deny that God is 'the Governor of the nations,' (Ps. xxii. 28,) is to deny his Divine providence, acknowledged in the Declaration of Independence, and to deny the providence of God is to deny his attributes. * * * It is that old story of Israel and human nature over again: 'Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked.' Temporal prosperity was too much for him. 'Then he forsook the God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation.'" (*Deut. xxxii. 15.*)

Then, quoting Dr. Mason's testimony, as we have already given it, to the omission of God and Christianity from the Constitution, Dr. Duffield asks: "Was this omission intentional, as in the original draft of the Declaration of Independence? or was it a moral oversight, even greater than the tremendous political oversight in the original Articles of Confederation?"—*The God of our Fathers*, pp. 13-15.

HORACE BUSHNELL, D. D., 1861.

The disaster at Bull Run, at the close of July, 1861, led our nation to try its ways and turn to the Lord. The Sabbath immediately following that dark day of national humiliation and shame, Dr. Bushnell, of Hartford, Connecticut, preached one of the most remarkable sermons called out by the war. This discourse is entitled "Reverses Needed." It is exceedingly difficult to make selections from the closely-linked discussion. The following must suffice:

"It is a remarkable, but very serious fact, not sufficiently noted, as far as my observation extends, that our grand Revolutionary fathers left us the legacy of this war in the ambiguities of thought and principle which they suffered in respect to the foundations of government itself. The real fact is that, without proposing it, or being distinctly conscious of it, they organized a government, such as we, at least, have understood to be without moral or religious ideas; in one view a merely man-made compact, which, without something further, which in fact was omitted or philosophically excluded, could never have more than a semblance of authority. More it has actually had, because our nation itself has been wiser and deeper, and closer to God, than our political doctrines; but we have been gradually wearing our nature down to the level of our doctrines, crushing out, so to speak, the sentiments in it that took hold of authority, till at last, we have brought ourselves down as closely as may be to the dissolution of all nationality and all ties of order. . . . Proximately our whole difficulty is an issue forced by slavery; but if we go back to the deepest root of the trouble, we shall find that it comes of trying to maintain a government without moral ideas, and concentrate a loyal feeling around institutions that, as many reason, are only human compacts, entitled, of course, if that be all,

to no feeling of authority, or even of respect. In all these schemings of theory by which we have been contriving to generate, or have generated, a government without going above humanity, we leave out all moral ideas, and take away all true forces necessary to government. Our merely terrene, almost subterranean, always godless fabric, becomes more and more exactly what we have taken it to be in our philosophy."

Then, while remarking that the time of our fearful conflict was "no time to agitate or put on foot political reforms of any kind," the author also says, in perfect harmony with the sentiment which less than three years later secured the formation of this Association:

"It might not be amiss, at some fit time, to insert in the preamble of our Constitution, a recognition of the fact that the authority of government, in every form, is derivable only from God; cutting off in this manner, the false theories under which we have been so fatally demoralized."—*Sermon*, pp. 9, 10, 13, 18, 26.

And now, in this immediate connection, I have to introduce the testimony of a witness, the very mention of whose name will cause many eyes to open wide with astonishment.

THE NEW YORK "INDEPENDENT," 1861.

Of all the opponents of the Religious Amendment, not one has so diligently hunted up difficulties and objections,—so persistently and unfairly assailed the movement and its supporters, as the *New York Independent*. And yet out of the mouth of this journal itself shall we now condemn its recent course and justify the men upon whom it would heap opprobrium. In the time of our national calamity it spoke the very language which to-day it denounces as unwise and intolerant. In its leading editorial for September 26, 1861, headed "The Lord's Indictment against the Nation," called forth by President Lincoln's proclamation for a national fast, after the Bull Run disaster, it says:

"The President calls upon us to-day, in sorrowful remembrance of our own faults and crimes as a nation, and as individuals, to humble ourselves before God, and to pray for His mercy. What, then, are the faults and crimes which stand more immediately connected with our public calamities—the sins which as a people we are called upon to confess and forsake? Some are disposed to dwell almost exclusively upon that huge organic iniquity which has struck its roots so deeply into our national history, which spreads over so large a portion of our territory. . . . But the root of our iniquities and calamities lies deeper even than this; and fruitful in sins and judgments as slavery has been, it is itself more a product than the cause of our national iniquity. . . . Jehovah has a broader indictment against us than is represented by this one count, even with all its frightful specifications. That indictment reads, 'Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that are corrupters! they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward.' To sum up the iniquity of this nation in one comprehensive charge, it is GODLESSNESS: not atheism in the philosophical sense of denying the existence of God, but that practical athe-

ism which ignores the law and authority of God and the requirements of religion in both public and private affairs: which leaves out of view the law of God as a rule of civil and social life, and the favor of God as an element of public prosperity.

"The specifications under this indictment are such as the following: Dr. Bushnell, in his sermon on the Bull Run disaster, has made prominent the fact that from the beginning we have shown our godlessness as a nation, *by ignoring the name and authority of God in the frame-work of our political institutions.* Neither the name of God, nor any reference to His law, His government, or His providence, can be found in the Constitution of the United States. Even the oath of fidelity administered to the President has no recognition of God or of the sanctions of religion. The only allusion of a religious kind in the Constitution is in the phrase, 'Sundays excepted,' in the ten days allowed the President for signing a bill: but this is because by usage in secular business Sunday is a *dies non*. The Constitution provides, as it should, against a religious establishment, religious tests, or any infringement upon the rights of conscience. But it does not even recognize the fact that it is an ordinance of God for the well-being of society that civil government shall exist; and that such government should be administered upon the principles of truth, justice, order and beneficence set forth in the moral government of God. 'We the people' made the Constitution, and 'We the people' have worshipped it as the mirror of our own wisdom and power. Not Pharaoh boasting: 'My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself;' not Nebuchadnezzar, strutting upon his palace wall and saying, 'Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?' was more vain-glorious and atheistic than we have been in boasting of the mechanism of our political institutions. We have allowed all men to have their own religion or no religion, under the Constitution; but the Constitution itself has nothing to do with religion except as a barrier between it and the State! Failing to discriminate between *legislating* for a particular creed or form of religion, and *recognizing* the great foundation truth of all religion—the just authority of a Holy and Almighty God, we have set up ourselves, our concrete nationality, 'We, the people,' as the original source of all authority and power, and have worshipped the work of our own hands. From this atheistic error in our prime conceptions of government has arisen the atheistic habit of separating politics from religion; the voter must not carry his religious scruples to the political caucus, nor set them against the party nominations at the polls; the minister must not bring politics into the pulpit, though the legislature should license dramshops and brothels, though Sodom should be rebuilt by the Salt Lake of Utah, though man made in the image of God should be sold like a brute under the bays of the national capitol. Nay, in the very Senate chamber, when Senators are warned that a measure is unjust and against the law of God, it is sneeringly, scornfully answered, that there is no law higher than the Constitution. 'We, the people,' made that, and 'We, the people,' can make and unmake laws as we please. This godless habit of thought and action has taken possession of the public mind in all political institutions and affairs. But he that sitteth in the heavens is teaching us that we can hold our Constitution, our Union, our government, our nationality, only by his pleasure."—*N. Y. Independent*, September 26, 1861.

Are you wonderingly asking, Is that all extracted from the "*Independent*?" Yes, every word of it, and more is found to the same ef-

fect, and all in the leading editorial. Nor will the convention object to the length of such an extract. What a grand "Religious Amendment" speech it is! In those days the *Independent* was a power in the land. Men of the broadest and finest culture, and of purest piety, spoke through its columns. Bacon, Storrs and Thompson discussed momentous questions on the principles of a profound political philosophy, and in constant acknowledgment of the authority of the word of God. And who can tell how much influence this very editorial of the *Independent* had in giving birth to the Religious Amendment movement? But the days of that triumvirate of scholarship and Christian patriotism and high-cultured ability have departed. Ichabod is written over the once glorious sheet. Digging through the rubbish of recent years, we bring to light some of the buried grandeur of the past. In utterances like this which I have read, when our nation avows itself a Christian nation and takes Jehovah as its acknowledged Lord, the memory of the *Independent* will be embalmed to latest generations.*

* The effect upon the *Independent* of being thus cited as a witness to a defect in which it has recently gloried as a chief excellence of the Constitution, was very remarkable. In its issue of February 26, it thus delivered itself: "A curious incident of the Christian Amendment Convention was the reading by its Secretary, the Rev. D. McAllister, with a very emphatic chuckle, of an editorial from the *Independent* of September 26th, 1861, on the occasion of the National Fast after Bull Run. The Convention enjoyed that editorial extremely, and it was a very able one. Its most emphatic position was, that 'from the beginning we have shown our godlessness as a nation by ignoring the name and authority of God in the framework of our political institutions.' . . . We had warning that this arrow was to be shot at us, stolen from our own quiver; for we afforded Mr. McAllister our politest assistance in showing him in our own office the editorial. . . . But his stolen arrow, though not quite true, is not so crooked as Mr. McAllister would pretend. Even then the *Independent* would have rejected scornfully the proposition of these fanatics to engraft the Christian religion into the Constitution. The utmost the *Independent* in its youth ever allowed was, that God, whose existence Jews and Pagans also accept, be recognized as the source of authority."

From the above it is evident that the editor of the *Independent* lost his temper. It is difficult to explain the application of the term "fanatics" to such men as Dr. Taylor Lewis, Prof. J. H. Seelye, Dr. A. A. Hodge, Mr. Brunot, Judge Strong, and any number of other men of like character, in any other way. But worse than this; the editor is not sufficiently careful concerning the truthfulness of his statements. He gives his readers distinctly to understand that he courteously showed the writer the editorial in question, and thus put into his hands a weapon of which he had no knowledge before. The extent of "showing" the editorial was simply granting the use of the files of the *Independent*. Thanks were due for this courtesy. But the editor manifestly had no knowledge of the editorial, was both surprised and mortified when it was pointed out to him, and only after a careful reading reluctantly admitted that it was the writer of the editorial, and not Dr. Bushnell, in the sermon referred to, who arraigned the Constitution for its "atheistic error."

The same moral obliquity is noticeable in the attempt to deny that the *Independent*, even in the days of indiscreet "youth," favored anything more than a bare acknowledgment of God, such as any Pagan might accept. "The burden of the indictment is, that 'neither the name of God nor any reference to his law . . . can be found in the Constitution of the United States.' Will the editor inform his readers what 'Law' this is? Is the Word of God utterly ignored as no part of his Law? Again, the indictment reads, 'The Constitution itself has nothing to do with religion except as a barrier between it and the State!' Will the editor vouchsafe a definition of the religion here referred to? Was it anything but Christianity? The following sentences from the editorial quoted, settle this point: 'Christianity, fairly applied, produces the purest democracy. . . . When its doctrine of the divine origin and redemption of the soul, and its precept of equal unselfish

HENRY A. BOARDMAN, D.D., 1862.

Among the most pointed and explicit of all the testimonies here accumulated, as to the religious defect of our Constitution, is that of Dr. Boardman, of Philadelphia, in a sermon preached in that city on September 14, 1862, and entitled "The Lord Reigneth." Having referred to the sins of the nation and their just punishment, he proceeds:

"Our duty is plain. We must search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord. The loss of his favor will explain everything that has happened. And the grand aim should be to learn how we have lost this favor, and by what means we can regain it. This is too large a theme to be discussed within the compass of a few pages. But there is one feature of our government too closely connected with this question and too conspicuous to be passed by in silence. I refer, as you will readily suppose—for the topic is a familiar one—to the absence of any adequate recognition of the sovereignty of God, and the religion of which he is the author and object, in our Constitution, and in the practical administration of our political system. It may be conceded that the spirit of Christianity is to a certain extent incorporated into our Constitutions. The legal recognition of the Sabbath, the oath on the Holy Evangelists, and the appointment of chaplains, are, so far, an acknowledgment of the Christian religion. But our national charter pays no homage to the Deity. His name does not once occur in the Constitution of the United States. And, as if to confound the charity which would refer this omission to some accidental agency, the same atheism is repeated and perpetuated in another form no less excusable. . . . The coinage of the United States is without a God. . . . Is it too much to hope that this opprobrium may be wiped away? If we have never been taught the lesson before, we are admonished of it now, that the 'Lord reigneth.' Has not the time come to make our formal national confession of this fundamental truth—to impress it upon our coinage; to insert it (peradventure it may not be too late,) as the keystone of our riven and tottering Constitution? If the country is not ready for these two simple but significant steps in the direction of Christianity, we have been chastened to very little purpose."—(*Sermon, pages 20-23.*)

DR. GEORGE JUNKIN, 1863.

This witness was long connected with Washington College, Va., and afterwards with Lafayette College, Pa., where he was Professor of Political Science. In his work on "Political Fallacies," speaking of the Constitution, he says:

"We have never believed it perfect. Doubtless some improvements are possible; but it makes abundant provision for them, without utter demolition. The principal

love prevail in any community, there all factitious pride and all unrighteous authority melt into the mighty brotherhood of humanity. The other theory of democracy regards man as by nature independent of all authority. . . . The high priest of the one theory is John Robinson kneeling at Leyden to commend the parting pilgrims in prayer to God. The high priest of the other is Voltaire at Ferney, writing down Christ as an impostor and his religion as a weak superstition. The fruit of the one is the Christian democracy of the Plymouth Colony; of the other, the atheistic democracy of the first French revolution—a deified Humanity usurping the place of God, and demanding that homage to its own pride which it refuses to God's authority."

It is to be hoped that the *Independent* will "wait upon the Lord, and renew its youth."

defect apparent to our vision meets us at the vestibule. The portico lacks one gem to perfect its lustre. There is union and justice, common defence and general welfare, blessing and liberty, but we cast our eyes about in vain for that which alone can give stability and beauty to the whole. The Koh-i-noor, whose radiant glories crown the grandeur of the beautiful temple, the Shekinah, is absent. The grand bond of our national Union does not distinctly acknowledge the being of a God. For more than forty years, a Fourth of July has seldom passed, on which I have not preached and warned my countrymen of this defect, and told them if it be not supplied, God would pull down their temple and bury a nation in its ruins. This warning has been sounded forth from thousands of pulpits in the land, and would have been much more extensively trumpeted but for the paralyzing influence of the fallacy couched in the demagogue's *double entendre*: 'Religion has nothing to do with politics.'—*Political Fallacies, pp. 305, 306.*

DR. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, 1863.

In an article in the *Danville Review*, entitled the "Divine Origin and Supremacy of Civil Government," Dr. Breckinridge writes: "We have imbibed the notion from our statesmen that government is a sort of compact among men, instead of an eternal principle." This theory of government he speaks of as "a theory essentially atheistic, and whose necessary consequence is anarchy, as is every arrangement that has no God in it." "What has the idea of government being a compact done for us? It has hatched in our bosom the monstrous prodigy of secession and anarchy." He then adds:

"It must be a source of shame and wonder that our Constitution, the embodiment of our system, has no mention of God in it. How in this its power is weakened? What bad morals it teaches the young offspring to be born and raised under its protecting ægis! And bitterly are we reaping the effects of its implied atheism, as well as presenting to the world the astonishing fact of a Constitution ignoring the only source of its power, without which not a single wheel of its machinery would ever move upon its pinions."—*Danville Review, Jan. 1864.*

JOHN NORTON POMEROY, LL.D., 1863.

Dr. Pomeroy, Professor of Political Science in the University of New York, is best known by his works on "Constitutional Law" and "Municipal Law." In the latter of these profound treatises, occurs the following testimony on the point in question:

"In the United States we have in theory, at least, banished all recognition of God. Yet some remains of our long education, lasting through centuries of our English history, are still preserved to us in the oaths administered to witnesses, and the forms of writs or judicial orders acknowledging that we exist as a free and independent people by the grace of God. I may be permitted here to express a fervent hope that, as a people, we are certainly Christian, so as a nation we may soon throw off our character of infidelity."—*Municipal Law, p. 194.*

"The theory of our National Constitution is that the State, as an organic body, has nothing whatever to do with religion, except to protect the individuals in what

ever belief or worship they may adopt; that religion is entirely a matter between each man and his God. . . . This is not the place to inquire into the correctness of our theory of the relations of the State to religion. It is not adopted by any other Christian government. . . . It is proper, however, to remark that there is a growing opinion among thoughtful men all over the country, that this thing should be abandoned, and that as a State we should acknowledge the claims of God upon us, and own him to be the Supreme Ruler of nations in their organic capacity, as well as of the single individuals who make up the nation."—*Municipal Law*, pp. 392, 393.

This brings us to the year of the formation of the National Association for the Religious Amendment of the Constitution. And thus our chain of testimony is complete, stretching its strong and closely connected links from the very year of the grave omission to the vigorous organized effort for its remedy.

And now, in closing, let me simply call attention to a number of important points concerning this chain of testimony:

1. The witnesses are citizens of the highest standing. Learned and patriotic men, lawyers, judges, divines, legislators, editors, professors of political science, all unite in harmonious and most explicit testimony to the religious defect of our Constitution. This mass of testimony might be indefinitely augmented by citing less eminent witnesses.

2. The testimony is calm and deliberate. It was not called forth in defense of any party or sect. There is nothing partisan or sectarian about it. Men of all shades of political opinion, of the different religious denominations, some of them not church members at all, so far as is known, in the South as well as in the North, lift up the same voice and point at the same lamented defect.

3. In times of national calamity and danger, the testimony becomes peculiarly emphatic. During the war of 1812, and again during the rebellion, when we were made to feel our dependence, as a nation, on God, we confessed our sin with evident sincerity. Voices now silent in the time of the nation's peace and prosperity, were ten years ago lifted up in solemn warning. But shall we conduct ourselves toward the God of nations, as Pagans have dealt with their divinities? Shall we betake ourselves to Him in the raging of the storm, and when the sun beams forth again, forget the power that protected us? If God is to be our refuge and our strength when the land is rocked to its foundations, let us have self-respect and dignity cter enough, if nothing more, to acknowledge Him when peace is extended to us like a river.

And truly this magnificent assemblage gives good ground for hope that the time when the defect pointed out shall be remedied cannot

be very far distant. One of the steps which Dr. Boardman twelve years ago deemed so important and imperatively necessary, has already been taken. We have impressed upon our coinage the sentiment to which patriot hearts thrilled response in our national agony: "In God we trust." The other step, the acknowledgment of God in the Constitution, will consistently, logically, and next in order, follow. Is not the gathering of these numerous delegates from so many States here to-day, the lifting of the nation's foot in readiness to stride onward in that very step which will settle it firm and fast on the foundation of eternal truth?

If the voices of the witnesses cited have sounded so potently down through the generations past, what must the effect of the voice of this convention be? Isolated voices, like streams converging from different declines, now mingle and sweep onward in one vast overwhelming current. The voice of this gathering is the voice of many waters. And tributaries now pouring in, and soon to pour in, in more frequent and abundant confluence, from Atlantic and Pacific slopes, from Rocky mountain heights, from rolling prairie land and granite hills and southern vales, will swell the volume and augment the power of these congregated waters until their voice shall be like the seven thunders round the throne, or the utterance of "ten thousand and times ten thousand and thousands of thousands" of angels and living creatures and elders in the ascending ascription, "Blessing and honor, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever."

The Rev. D. R. Kerr, D.D., then pronounced the benediction, and the Convention adjourned to meet at half-past seven in the evening.

EVENING SESSION, FEB. 26.

The Convention re-assembled at half-past seven o'clock, and was called to order by the President. After prayer by the Rev. Dr. Kieffer, the President introduced the Rev. R. Audley Brown, D.D., who spoke as follows:

RELATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THOSE WHO OPPOSE IT.

ADDRESS OF REV. R. A. BROWNE, D. D.

The association organized to secure a recognition of Christianity in the Constitution of the United States, has cause for congratulation and thankfulness for the progress made—that the issues involved are becoming clearer, and the natural enemies and

the natural friends of the movement are ranging themselves on their appropriate sides. The Christianity of this country cannot vote Christ out of its Constitution and laws. Thank God for the assurance that when this question at issue shall at last be fairly and fully comprehended, this great Christian people will inevitably place such a recognition of their Christianity in their fundamental law as shall leave room no longer for the assertion that we are not a Christian people, nation, and government.

One phase of this subject devolves on me at this time, viz: to consider the appeal made to popular prejudice against this movement, that it contemplates depriving citizens as good as others, in a political point of view, of their just rights, by proscribing their faith and making it impossible for them to take the oath to support the Constitution of the United States, as is required of aliens as a condition of naturalization, of lawyers as a condition to their practicing at the bar, and of the members of our several State Legislatures, and Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in the National Congress, and judges and executive officers, as a condition to official station. It is alleged that if the amendment were once adopted, all persons who do not believe that God is the author of power in government, Jesus Christ Governor among the nations, and the Bible of supreme authority, would be excluded from taking the oath, enjoying citizenship, and holding office. In this point of view, the movement is gravely stigmatized by its enemies as one to insert a theological creed in a purely political instrument; and it is asserted it ought not to be adopted because nothing should be admitted into the Constitution that would deprive any man of his natural rights, and that it should only contain those inevitable principles on which all men of every creed can conscientiously agree.

Then I reply first, the Constitution will be very brief, indeed; much briefer than it is at present; for it contains the war power and asserts capital punishment, right in the teeth of the convictions of some of our citizens. But I answer further, if the principle of the objection be true, we never could have a government or Constitution at all, so long as one man among forty millions of people, less or more, should be found objecting and standing upon his conscience; though what would become, in that case of the consciences of all the rest would be a very perplexing question, and we should have such an exhibition of the one man power as the world has never seen.

But the objection is purely an assumption, without any foundation whatever. It is an assumption that the declarations proposed in the form in which they are offered are a creed presented for subscription. It is also a pure assumption that an oath to support the Constitution containing them would be a profession of belief in them. Read the proposed amendment. Is not this what a Christian people believe? And is not this a Christian people? If it be so, is it incorrect in principle any more than false in fact to insert it in the Constitution? Now, if any man cannot see this fact and support the Constitution declaring it, then I am willing to say he ought to be excluded from citizenship and office, on the score, not of his heresy, but of his stupidity.

If any man, then, friend or foe of this movement, thinks the amendment would keep men who are godless in their belief and practice from being naturalized as citizens, or from being admitted to practice law in our courts; or from being sworn into office as legislators, judges and executives in the States or in the nation, I am sorry to say he is mistaken. He does not live so near the millennium as that. I would like the movement a great deal better if I could think a mere amendment to the Constitution of the United States would keep our citizenship, our courts, legisla-

tures and Congresses and executive chambers pure, including such municipal governments as the city of New York.

The amendment will do good; but all that is good it cannot do. They who think so, and especially as the objection applies to our candidates for legislative honors in the State or nation, have miscalculated or underestimated the character of a portion of that large class of citizens constituting our candidates for office. There is no more persistent man alive than the typical representative American office-seeker. Of that class, the most of those who have not yet found whether they are for Christ or not, or who are openly decrying this movement, are ready to be its firm friends as soon as they acquire wisdom to discern the signs of the times and are assured of its speedy success. They may pull back now at the hind axle, or scotch the wheels of the car of progress, but when they see it move, they will quickly jump in to get front seats, and avow "they always thought it was a good thing." When our Master comes into his kingdom in our beloved land, they will be candidates for the foremost positions, and scramble with the mother of Zebedee's children for the right or left hand places in the kingdom. Our reform will be a great attainment made—it will give undisputed and impregnable foundation to our Christian civil Sabbath, marriages, oaths, chaplaincies and the Christian principles and usages of our common and statute law. But it will still remain for eternal vigilance at the polls to keep our parties pure, and all the appliances of Christian education to infuse God-fearing morality into the public mind.

Now, if the preceding statements be correct, neither Hebrews, Unitarians nor infidels would be excluded under the amended Constitution, any more than they now are under existing State and national constitutions and laws. I mention these classes, for they are specially cited and their claims urged as an argument against us by the opposers of our movement. Of these latter classes, William Ellery Channing, one of the purest men of the country, the eminent Unitarian clergyman of Boston, and John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, the second and third Presidents of the United States, are selected as examples; and it is urged against the amendment that such men as these could not have held citizenship, nor could the last two named have been inaugurated into the Presidency of the nation under the Constitution, had it contained the clause now proposed. Now, as to the views held by these eminent citizens, they will themselves be admitted as good authority. Wm. Ellery Channing died before this association was formed, but in one of his published sermons, we have his advocacy of its fundamental principles; so being dead he yet speaks, and refutes the claim made for him by the enemies of this movement. It so happens also that we have the sentiment of John Adams in his state papers, as President of the United States, and they do not justify the assertions of our opponents, but are directly opposed to them. One of these papers is a proclamation for a National Fast for the 9th of May, 1798. In this paper he recommends the people of the United States to meet in their places of worship and beseech God (to quote his own words) "of his infinite grace, through the Redeemer of the world, freely to remit all our offences, and to incline us by his Holy Spirit to sincere repentance and reformation." The following year President Adams proclaimed another fast for March 6th, and in his proclamation he calls the nation to make an acknowledgment of the governing providence of a Supreme Being as taught "in the volume of inspiration." He proceeds to announce the dangers of French infidelity in these words: "The most precious interests of the people of the United States are still held in jeopardy by the hostile designs and insidious acts of a foreign nation, as by the dissemination among them of

those principles [viz: infidel principles,] subversive to the foundations of all religious, moral and social obligations, that have produced incalculable mischief and misery in other countries." In view of these perils, he says, we should "give our religion the character of a national act."—He, therefore, calls upon the citizens, on the day designated as a fast, to "implore God's pardoning mercy through the Great Mediator and Redeemer for our past transgressions, and that through the grace of his Holy Spirit we may be disposed and enabled to yield a more suitable obedience to his righteous requisitions in time to come; that he would interpose to arrest the progress of that impiety and licentiousness in principle and practice so offensive to himself and so ruinous to mankind." This is as much, if not more, than our amendment proposes. And it is not to be supposed that Mr. Adams, in his capacity as President of this nation, could use such language to his fellow-citizens, and yet oppose the insertion in the Constitution of a clear recognition of his right so to do, as our Christian amendment proposes.

Now, as to Thomas Jefferson's views, some mystery prevails. He has been often claimed and often conceded to be an infidel. The manifest truth is that, if he had lived in these times, he would have been recognized as a Unitarian of the liberal school. As President he objected to proclaim either thanksgivings or fasts as his predecessors had done, not recognizing his authority so to do under the Constitution. What he would have done in this respect, however, under a different Constitution, we learn from the part he took in the colonial government of Virginia in the stirring times preceding the Revolution. A brief recital will be of interest. On the 16th of December, 1773, occurred the Boston tea-party. That is now one hundred years ago, December 16th last. It was probably the biggest tea-party ever held in the country, if we take into account the amount of tea used; and it was, I presume, the most famous tea-party that ever occurred in the history of the world. But one back-set took place afterwards. As soon as the parental government of Great Britain heard of it, they enacted the Boston Port bill, closing Boston harbor against all commerce, to go into effect on the 1st of June, 1774. That will be one hundred years past on next 1st of June. Now, the Apostle tells us that if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; and this was true of Massachusetts and Virginia, although no two colonies could well be more unlike. The thrill of an aroused patriotism pulsed in the veins of patriots in Virginia as well as Massachusetts, over the indignity threatened by the parent government. The House of Burgesses (being the Colonial Legislature) of Virginia met in the May following. In that body were those eminent patriots, George Washington, George Mason (afterwards a signer of the declaration) and Thomas Jefferson. To Jefferson and others it appeared that the House of Burgesses should do something in their legislative capacity in view of the encroachment on American liberties involved in the Boston Port bill; they would proclaim a fast and appoint it for that very day, the first of June, and call on all the churches in Virginia to observe it. Jefferson gives an account of it, in his characteristic way. He says that by "the help of Rushworth" they "rummaged over the revolutionary precedents" for such appointments, none of which had been made since 1755, the time of the French and Indian troubles; and having prepared their resolution, they got Mr. Nicholas, whose grave and reverend character made him a suitable person for that service, to offer it. It was promptly adopted, and as soon as Governor Dunmore was apprized of it, he promptly dissolved them. But they kept the day, nevertheless. Their proclamation ran as follows:

"Tuesday, 25th of May, 14th George III., 1774."

"This House being deeply impressed with apprehension of the great dangers to be derived to British America from the hostile invasion of the city of Boston in our sister colony of Massachusetts Bay, whose commerce and harbor are on the first day of June next to be stopped by an armed force, deem it highly necessary that the said first day of June be set apart by the members of this House as a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer, devoutly to implore the Divine interposition for averting the heavy calamity which threatens destruction to our civil rights, and the evils of civil war; to give us one heart and one mind firmly to oppose by all just and proper means every injury to American rights; and that the minds of his Majesty and his Parliament may be inspired from above with wisdom, moderation, and justice, to remove from the loyal people of America all cause of danger from a continued pursuit of measures pregnant to their ruin. Ordered, therefore, that the members of this House do attend in their places at the hour of ten in the forenoon, on the first day of June next, in order to proceed, with the Speaker and mace, to the church in the city, for the purpose aforesaid; and that the Reverend Mr. Price be appointed to read prayers and to preach a sermon suitable to the occasion.

"GEORGE WYTHE, C. H. B."

"By the House of Burgesses,

Now that is what Jefferson thought of a people's relation to God in great emergencies, and indicates what he might have been willing to do in regard to such a proclamation as President, had he deemed the Constitution as it is afforded a warrant for issuing them. In this close construction he differed from his immediate predecessor and from Washington also; both of them as great in statesmanship as he. But the question we have now to consider is the allegation that Thomas Jefferson could not have taken the oath as President to sustain the Constitution, if it had included our amendment recognizing Christianity. My reply is, that Thomas Jefferson was a member of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, a British colony, in 1774, and as such he took an oath of office including more than an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, with this Christian amendment incorporated in it, namely, an oath to support the charter of the colony and the British Constitution, in both of which was a recognition of Christianity, and also of that to which we are all opposed, a union of Church and State.

Now, it is evident that when the opponents of this movement speak for Unitarians, and for such statesmen as John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, they are in error. When they would perform the part of godfathers for those eminent men, they have mistaken their vocation. These men are dead, but being dead they yet speak for themselves. "I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past." I only know what these men would do by what they have done; and the fact that their words and their lives refute the claim that they could not have sworn to support a Constitution recognizing Christianity, as is proposed in our Amendment.

As for the Israelite, he now observes and supports our laws and institutions, and could not be a citizen without so doing. Let me quote one of these, a statute of the State of Pennsylvania:

Act of 31st March, 1860. * * * * *

"If any person shall wilfully, premeditatedly and despitefully blaspheme or speak loosely and profanely of Almighty God, Christ Jesus, the Holy Spirit, or the Scriptures of Truth, such person, on conviction thereof, shall be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars (100) and undergo an imprisonment not exceeding three months, or either, at the discretion of the court."—*Pardon*, p. 810, § 1.

These and all our other Christian laws are right or they are wrong. If right, they should be constitutional, and if not constitutional, they should be made so. If right

and constitutional for Pennsylvania, they should be so for every part of the United States as well. The Hebrew is under them as well as the Gentile, as he of right ought to be. It does not injure his conscience. He does not hold a particle more of the Christian creed in consequence, nor is he required so to do; nor would he, by an oath of citizenship, if a firm constitutional foundation were put under all these—our Christian institutions and laws. An oath to support a Constitution is not an oath to profess a creed, notwithstanding the wild assertions of the opponents of this movement. If any further reply be needed, I refer to the precedent of the British Constitution, under which a Hebrew takes the oath to support the Constitution, and sits in the House of Commons. It makes no difference that it is an unwritten Constitution—it is a Constitution for all that; and it is a Constitution recognizing Christianity as fully as that of the United States would do if the Christian amendment were in full force.

And now, in the close of this subject, let us be conscious we war against no right of man, and we cannot as Christian citizens fail in our fealty to the claims of our Master on our land. This vast assembly represents the millions of Christians of our country who believe that "Christ is Lord of all," and that the United States are no exception; who believe that "all power is given Him in heaven and in earth," and that the realm of politics is no more beyond His righteous government than is anything else. Be it ours to speed the fiery cross over hill and valley, to kindle the beacon fires till mountain top shall send forth its ruddy glow to mountain top. When all the Christians of our land shall be awakened to see the need, and speak for their Lord, our movement will be a fact accomplished, and a constitutional foundation shall stand impreguably under the fair structure of our Christian institutions and laws.

The President then introduced the Rev. David R. Kerr, D. D., who spoke as follows:

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY OF NATIONS.

ADDRESS OF REV. DAVID R. KERR, D. D.

MR. PRESIDENT:—Your General Secretary has requested me to speak on the subject before you, in the aspect of national responsibility to God; and to keep what I may say inside of half an hour, all of which I will endeavor to do, and as the subject is rather large, and the time rather short, and as in the course of my remarks I may swing a little from a perfectly straight line of thought, I had better begin without any unnecessary preliminaries.

There is one thought I cannot pass, in approaching the subject; one of wonder that there should be among Christian people any diversity of opinion in regard to the importance of some such movement as that in behalf of which this Convention is assembled. I can understand why they who rule God out of their own hearts and lives, and would rule him out of the universe, if they could, would feel opposed to any recognition of him by the nation. But that men who love and adore him as God over all, who rejoice in their own personal allegiance to him as their Saviour and their King, should show unwillingness to have him exalted in the nation, and formally acknowledged in the supremacy of authority, is not so easily understood.

In the lowest view of national responsibility, that in which the nation is regarded

as a mere aggregation of individuals, and the responsibility only such as each individual separately bears, it would seem that one who believes in God and the revelation he has given of himself in the Bible, should be willing to have him, as thus revealed, acknowledged in the national as in all the other relations of his life. It is true, the nation exists for earthly ends, or is not primarily a religious organization; but that does not relieve the individuals of it of their moral responsibilities. These go with them into all the relations of life in which they can be placed. The Bible injunction is, "In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy steps." Now, why should not Christians feel bound so to acknowledge God and be directed by him in their national relations and duties? What is it that makes this application of the principle so startling to many good people?

Mr. President, the first necessity of this movement is an awakening among Christians themselves. It is not from atheists, or Deists, or infidels of any class that we have most to fear. It is the indifference, the opposition, to some extent, of the Christian mind of the nation. Let this be awakened and united in this movement, and it would have a moral power that would be irresistible in this land. But, unhappily, there is division among us. There are some brethren who refuse to admit that the Constitution has the defect of which we complain. These, I think, are not so confident as they have been. They have been reading the Constitution, and many of them are not quite clear that a form of presidential oath which an atheist might take, or the marking of the date of the instrument in the only way in which it could be marked in the use of the existing calendar, is such a recognition of God as in their hearts they could desire. Others are troubled with fears of union of Church and State, and violence to consciences of which they are far more tender than the men who own them. These brethren are learning that what we propose is not altogether an untried experiment in this country; that in many of our State Constitutions there are acknowledgments of God, against which their objections would be just as strong as against what is sought for the National Constitution; and as they have not heard of any unions of Church and State there, nor any grievous sufferings of conscience, it is to be hoped they will yet get over their fears. But perhaps the most plausible plea against us is made by those who hold that the nation is Christian, and as really so as if the name of the Christian's God were put into the Constitution a thousand times. Grant it that such an acknowledgment would not make the nation any more really Christian than it is. A like thing can be said of a personal profession of religion. That does not make a Christian man or woman; but it is a very material part of Christian duty, nevertheless, and such as all who have felt the renovating power of our religion will count it a pleasure and honor to perform. So, in regard to the nation, if it be in fact Christian, if in its essential elements it be an outgrowth of Christianity, if it be the highest existing development of Christian civilization, who that loves our religion should not desire to see the great fact emblazoned on the nation's organic law?

All this and much more might be said in addressing Christian men on their individual responsibilities. But there is more than individual responsibility involved here. A nation is not a mere aggregation of individuals; nor is it strictly a mere voluntary association. It is rather the growth of a people providentially brought together in the same land, who, through common interests, common trials, and common struggles, grow into a community with united interest, united power, and united responsibility. It thus becomes an organic unity, a moral personality before God, with a free agency and accountability, as clear and binding as any moral obligation

that rests on the individual man. And it becomes so, not from a providential development merely, but under an express ordinance of God. "The powers that be," says an Apostle, "are ordained of God; whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." The particular form of organization may be left to circumstances, or the judgment and choice of the people; but when formed, it comes under God's ordinance, and is subject to his law, as revealed to all men in the light of nature, but more fully to us in the light of revelation, and so much the more increasing our responsibility.

A nation so exists, whether it has a written Constitution or not. Many of the colonies which grew into the States which by union formed our national government, had no written Constitution properly so-called. England to this day has no such Constitution. Statutes, decisions, and customs, continued and cumulating for centuries, make up its supreme law. But when a nation does put itself under a written Constitution, if true to itself, it will make it a true expression of its national character. And it is because the nation we love, and in which we live, has not done this, as we believe, that we are pleading with it to put itself right before God, and in its true character before the nations of the world. We plead that the acknowledged character of the nation shall have suitable expression in its organic law. Is there anything unreasonable in this? If it were a Mohammedan nation, it would have such an expression; if it were a Pagan nation, it would have such expression; and why should not a Christian nation have expression of what is distinctive of it? In its case, this is not only reasonable, but imperative. It must so declare its character, or be unfaithful to its highest obligations. In the view of unity and moral personality that has been taken, and especially of the obligation imposed by the ordinance of God, it has no escape from this responsibility.

Nations have no difficulty in recognizing and acting on the principle of national responsibility in their dealings with each other. In our recent troubles with Spain on account of the capture of the *Virginius* and the barbarous deeds that followed, we did not go to the individuals who perpetrated the outrage; we did not go to Cuba with our demand of reparation; we took our case directly to those who represented the supreme authority of Spain. From the *nation* we demanded reparation, and from it we received it. On the same principle God deals with all nations. They may refuse to acknowledge his authority; they may seek to throw off all responsibility to him; but it is in his prerogative and power to hold them to it, whether they acknowledge it or not. He claims, not only under his general ordinance, but in specific terms, to be the "Governor among the nations;" and in his Providence, as in his word, has shown that he does "judge among the nations," and that "blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." The sacred history abounds with records of this, not only in respect to the chosen people, but the nations around them whose history is interwoven with theirs. And in records outside of the sacred history, we have the evidences, in all the ages, of his judgment and power, approving or condemning, blessing or punishing, the nations according to their character and acts. The history of our own nation is a sufficient illustration of this; as, also, of the fact that no existing nation of all the world has been brought under greater obligations to acknowledge and honor him.

Consider the origin of this nation. We see this away back in the first movings of the new life and power that arose among the nations of the old world in the grand events of the 16th century. That life had not the needed freedom there. It was hampered by the very rubbish of the old foundations that had been broken up;

with all its enlarged liberties it was still restrained by the old habits of thought, and the old forms of social and civil, as well as religious life, that still remained. It needed a new world for more perfect development, and the Lord gave it this on the virgin soil of this great continent. To preserve for it a home here, he had withheld from the old world even the knowledge of this continent until shortly before the period of its great awakening in reforming times. Then, after the nations there had been sifted and the chosen people had been found, they were brought here, and planted here as the germ that has since grown into the splendid proportions of this great republic. In its growth, and in all the forms in which it clothed itself, in all the stages of its growth, it had clear and strong expression of its Christian character down to the time of its organization under the present Constitution. But at that time, when above all times it should have reverently remembered the God who planted and protected and prospered it, it suffered itself so far to forget him as not even to give his name a place in its organic law. The nation, in its essential character, was Christian still; and if the people of the nation had rightly understood that they were asked to put themselves under a Constitution as good for Pagans or Mohammedans as for Christians, they never would have consented. They would have risen in an indignation that would have forced some becoming acknowledgment of their religion and their God.

By a remarkable coincidence this unfaithfulness to God was associated with a like flagrant disregard of the rights of man. The nation planted and fostered in the interests of religion and liberty is organized in recreancy to both. In violation of all its instincts of freedom, and in the face of its public declaration of the inalienable rights of man, it recognized and tolerated the system of slavery, so long the shame and the curse of the land. There is not in all history a more remarkable instance of national abnegation. It may have been thought that such a system could not long exist under the influence and operation of the free institutions established. But given constitutional recognition it did exist, and it grew until it became a dominant power of the nation, was able for years to dictate its policy, and at length grew so bold as to demand an extension of its power or a division of the nation. We all remember how that issue was met; and we should remember how doubtfully it was contested until the nation rose to the grandeur of its true ideal of liberty to all the inhabitants of the land. When the struggle began, our rulers had no thought of the destruction of slavery, and our armies were almost everywhere discomfited until the time of the immortal proclamation of freedom. From almost the very hour of that proclamation the tide of battle turned; our armies moved on from victory to victory, until the rebellion was crushed and the authority of the nation was acknowledged throughout all its borders. The grand results have been secured in constitutional amendments. So God has led us back through an ordeal of blood to consistency, duty, and honor in respect to the rights of man.

Now, can any one believe that God is less jealous of his own honor and of his own inalienable rights? Or that he can have less controversy with the nation for its failure to acknowledge the prerogatives that belong to him? At first, and for a time, there may have been some palliation of the offence. It may have been felt by our fathers, in allowing the omission, that the Christian character of the nation was so well understood, and that Christianity itself would remain so fully recognized as the common law of the land, that a formal acknowledgment of it was not necessary. But we can plead for excuse no such delusion now. Enemies coming in like a flood, are threatening all that is distinctive and all that is ennobling in the Chris-

tian character of the nation. With a boldness growing with their numbers, they demand that our Bible be thrown out of the public schools; that our religious oath shall be abolished; that the ministers of our religion shall be driven out of the halls of Congress and State Legislatures, as also from all chaplaincies in the army and navy of the nation; that our marriage and Sabbath laws shall be repealed; that all national acknowledgment of God in days of thanksgiving or humiliation before him shall be abandoned; and all legislation in favor of Christian morality shall cease; that everything distinctively Christian shall be blotted out from the nation. The issue has been made. The battle has begun. The enemy is moving on our incomplete defenses. He tells us that he has the sanction of the Constitution; that he bears the banner of the nation, and flaunts in our faces one whose dark folds bear the dismal motto, "No God, No Christ, No Christian Morality!"

O, is it not time for the Christian people of this nation to be awakened and united in the resistance of an enemy forcing such an issue as this? Ought we not to put the nation in such relations to God that, in defending his prerogatives, we may look for his help in defending and perpetuating our own priceless privileges? Men, Christian men, tell us that what is needed is more earnest and diligent evangelistic work to bring the people of the nation more under the influence of our religion. That, of course, is of the first importance. But let these men take the outposts of our religion; let them go on unopposed in all their insidious workings to create a public opinion against our Christian laws and institutions, until they shall have virtually if not formally subverted them, and have our religion dishonored in all the high places of the land, and in what condition would we be left? Under what fearful disabilities would our evangelistic work be placed?

Away with all the miserable pleas with which any Christian man can excuse neutrality in such a conflict as this. Of what force at the throne of God will be all pleadings from the fears of union of Church and State and violence to consciences of men, in most of whom neither religion nor conscience has any existence that they respect. We want no union of Church and State. Let that proposition be made in this country, and there is no element of the opposition that would rise against it that would be more decided and determined than that represented in this Convention. We wish no restraint upon the rightful liberties of any man. But we would have the God of all men and all consciences acknowledged in his rights. We would have him as the God of this nation exalted in the land, and acknowledged in the supremacy of his authority and the glory of his name.

The President then introduced Prof. Charles A. Blanchard, of Wheaton College, Illinois, who spoke as follows:

THE CONFLICT OF LAW.

ADDRESS OF PROF. CHARLES A. BLANCHARD.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The apparent and immediate question before us, Shall the Constitution of the United States be so changed as to recognize the authority of God, His Christ, and His Word? The ultimate and real question is, Are the American people to be and continue a Christian nation?

In opposition to the views held by those who called this Convention, extremes meet. Atheistic blasphemers and "doctors" of a sick divinity vie with one another in the endeavor to prevent any national recognition of the fact, that it is by virtue of powers derived from above, that laws are made for the government of men. Should this movement fail, (as it will not,) most of our religious (?) papers would rejoice, while every infidel club and grog-shop in the land would celebrate the result with laughter and shout the dishonor of our God.

Of course opposition thus diverse in character does not spring from the same source. As in material warfare, some fight for gain, some for vengeance, some for glory, and some because "sweet and beautiful it is for fatherland to die;" so in this war on the recognition of Christ, the ribald atheist is moved by forces which do not consciously influence the Christian man who honestly differs from us in opinion.

The Christian says, Our nation is already Christian in sentiment, and can be made more so only by individual act. Putting one or a dozen mentions of Christ into the Constitution will not convert an infidel or save a soul. Very true, neither will putting a pump into a well make any more water. We don't put pumps into wells for the purpose of increasing the water supply, but for the purpose of using what is already there. So it is proposed to put this recognition of God and Christ and the Bible into the Constitution, not to make more Christian sentiment, but to use a Christian conviction already existing;—to pump (if you will allow the expression) the Christian feeling of the American people into the law on marriage, the Sabbath, and honesty, until our laws adequately represent our belief.

The infidel, on the other hand, says, "The Constitution is atheistic, and should remain so. To recognize God as you wish, would be a practical union of Church and State; would be oppressive and wrong." Still further; "Many of our laws are distinctively Christian, and between them and the atheistic Constitution there is a conflict of law; this conflict must be settled by abrogating all such Christian laws. Water can rise by its own act no higher than its source, neither can law. The Constitution is the source of law. It is atheistic, and the laws must be."

The infidel is both right and wrong;—right, when he contends that there is a conflict of law; wrong, when he says that we labor for a union of Church and State. Even if we were seeking such a union, we would be more nearly in the right than those who have already united the State and the saloon. It would be far better to have average Christian men for office holders, than the drunken, thieving crew who now steal the public money and demoralize the public conscience. It would be far better to have the ballot box in the meeting house than in the rum shop, where profane oaths, floods of filthy tobacco juice and barrels of whisky help Americans to select their legislators. But union of Church and State is the selection by the nation of one church, the endowment of such a church, the appointment of its officers and oversight of its doctrines. For such a union none of us plead. To such a union we are all of us opposed. What we do ask is, that the nation tell its own people and the world by what God it swears its judges, and what is its standard of right and wrong.

POSITION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

The Constitution declares that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and also that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. These statements are very general. No law may be made prohib-

ing the free exercise of religion. But who is to decide what is religion? The citizens, of course, for Congress may make no law respecting an establishment of religion. Every man may choose his religion, or make a new one, and Congress may not prohibit its free exercise. Tartar, Confucian, and Hindoo, may bring their gods many and lords many; the Moslem minaret may shine in the setting sun from every hill; every graveyard become a temple for celestial worshippers of the dead. Every one of India's three hundred million gods may leave that land where the snow of Himalaya stands silent sentinel, and Cape Cormorin looks out upon the summer sea. Every one of them may come to this Christian land, and here find a congenial home.

We cannot say, as a nation, that they do not have good religions, for we must pass no act respecting the establishment of religion. We cannot forbid their practice, for we must not prohibit its free exercise.

It answers no good purpose to say that wife-burning, man-sacrificing, and babe-killing, are not religious practices. These things are done by millions, in the name of religion. When we say they are not religious acts, we make a law respecting the establishment of religion. When we prohibit them, we prohibit its free exercise. The Greek may bring his god of debauchery. He may commit all the nameless crimes which darken the fair name and fame of Attica. We must not say a word. He must worship his own god in his own way.

There is nothing too absurd for men to believe. There is no crime so great that men may not commit in the name of religion. Greece had her gods of theft, drunkenness, and murder; Germans and Britons, their altars of human sacrifice; Spain, the fagot and the boot; India, the Ganges for the babe, the suttee for the wife, and Jugernaut for the man. Any or all these foul blots on the history of our race, may be transferred from a past, over which angels might weep tears of blood, to our own America, and we have no constitutional right to object.

The American people must not say that the Bible is the Word of God, and that Christianity is the religion of this country; for the exclusion of such religious practices as have been named, is prohibiting the free exercise of religion, and hence unconstitutional. This is the Constitution which the infidel likes, and to which he wants our law adapted. He desires to admit the loathsome, devilish systems of all heathendom to our own Columbia, by prohibiting the declaration that God is the author of national life, that Christ is the ruler of nations, and that the Bible is the foundation of law. The man who should introduce the plague, or pluck down red lightnings from the heavens, and smite us out of existence, would be merciful and benevolent when compared with such a man.

"The laurel wreath that murder wears,
Blood-nursed and watered by the widow's tears,
Seems not so foul, so tainted, or so dread,
As waves the night-shade round this skeptic head."

POSITION OF STATE LAWS.

"But," says the Christian objector, "the laws of the States do not permit wife-burning and man-eating religions. Bigamy is punished by law in every State of the Union, and the mother found tossing her babe to a hungry shark, would be locked up in the prison or the mad house. Sabbath laws, chaplains, and chapels, in every department of public service, attest the national regard for religion." True again. But what right has the Government to tax me to sustain a chapel or chaplain, when it has nothing to do with religion, and I don't believe in any God? What right to

interfere with the suttee, when my religion commands it? What right to imprison for bigamy, if my religion teaches it, and I am free to practise any religion I choose? The answer is plain. Just no right at all. No law which forbids the free exercise of religions which call for human sacrifice, adultery, or blasphemy, can stand a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Nay, more. Suppose, (and you but suppose a fact,) that a body of voters say that their church has authority over the State in civil concerns; suppose, further, that these voters honestly believe that their eternal salvation depends on implicit obedience to their priests in temporal as well as spiritual matters; suppose, once more, that the priests teach the people to set up another sovereignty on this soil, to collect arms and train soldiers in pursuance of this religious conviction, and, finally, suppose that they (in obedience to religious instruction) make war on the United States. What then? Why then our officials and people are bound to stand still and have their throats cut. For we cannot say that this is not a religious service, and if it be, we have no right to prohibit it. You say, "This is absurd." Of course it is. That is precisely what we wish to show the American people. To say to the world that we will have no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion, and then putting men in prison or hanging them for exercising theirs, is to advertise ourselves to the world as liars or fools, or both. This conflict of law is inevitable and irrepressible. Our laws will be heathenized or our Constitution Christianized, and Americans must soon decide which they will have done.

THE CHANGE AN ACT OF JUSTICE TO THE PRESENT.

To settle this conflict by Christianizing the Constitution is only an act of justice to the men who came here to live under our laws.

Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weights, and measures. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion, as it already has the Oneida Community in New York, the Mormons in Utah, and the Joss House in California.

Suppose a man decide to worship the God of stealing, and one day, while performing his devotions, puts a package of water bonds into his valise and starts on a pilgrimage. He is arrested, taken before the court, and declares that he worships Mercury; that it is part of his religion to steal. The judge says, You must not worship your god of stealing, and you must go to the penitentiary, if you offer your devotion to this divinity. Public sentiment says the judge is right; the Constitution says he is wrong. To tell a man he may worship any god in any way he likes, and then imprison him because he takes you at your word, is rank injustice. Tell the man that the Bible is fundamental law, and then let him worship his thieving godling at his peril. Even the reader of the non-committal paper on this subject at the late Evangelical Alliance had a faint glimmer of this absurdity, and said near the close of his article that it might be necessary to insert in the Constitution some fundamental principles of natural religion, as if any one knew what natural religion is.

IT IS ALSO AN ACT OF JUSTICE TO THE PAST.

Nor do we owe this change to the present alone; the past also has claims upon us. The land was not founded by atheists and infidels. When the liberties we enjoy were secured, these haters of the Bible, or their ancestors, were contentedly

grinding in the mills of despotism which their heathenism had established away beyond the sea.

Pilgrims and Puritans planted the New England colonies; Reformers from Holland the colony of New York; Friends, Pennsylvania; and Huguenots, Florida. They came here to establish a Christian Commonwealth, and they did it. They honored the Sabbath, and said that it must not be desecrated. They revered God, and said that his name must not be profaned. They looked to the true-hearted women who stood beside them, and said that many-wived religionists must worship their filthy gods in other lands.

In defence of the sacred principles of freedom which are found in the Bible, and nowhere else in all the earth, they stood and suffered and died. The barren earth, the hungry wolf, and the silent savage drank their blood.

Ay, call it holy ground,
That spot where first they trod;
They have left unstained what there they found,
Freedom to worship God.

Not to worship devils or gods, but God. Dying, they handed down the Christian Republic to us, their children; and their solemn earnest voices speak to us to-day from the hills where they lie buried, bidding us be true to the trust committed to our charge.

WE CAN CLAIM THIS RECOGNITION AS OUR HERITAGE.

I know it is fashionable on the part of brainless broadcloth and beer-mugged stupidity to ridicule those grand old fathers of freedom as narrow-minded bigots; to say that they hanged their cats on Monday, if they caught rats on the Sabbath, and whipped the beer-barrel, if it worked on the first day of the week. It is all well. Let them laugh. I have no right to be proud at any time, but I have also no right to cease being thankful, that in my own veins runs blood come down from the swordsmen of Cromwell, and that my other and better self had ancestors who knelt at the Grey Friars' church-yard at Edinburgh, and shook hands with death at Drum-clog and Bothwell's Bridge.

And, I ask, are the children of such men to be told, here in this land subdued by their labors and sanctified by their graves, that they have no rights which blaspheming infidels are bound to respect? Must we bow down before a baker's dozen of atheists, and banish the word of God from the public schools at their behest? Because some Bible-haters wish to come here and enjoy privileges for which our Bible-loving fathers freely poured out the red wine of life, must we tax the churches where they prayed, and the graves where they lie buried? Are these men, who are so fearful of Church and State, to be permitted to join whisky and the State by a marriage bond which naught but national death can sever? Is it for this we have the silent tombs of Lexington, and Saratoga, and Valley Forge? Is it to furnish a place where, under the name of Liberty, men should be free to violate God's laws; under the name of Equality, be degraded below the brutes; and under that of Fraternity be made brothers with devils, that the rivers of our fair land run by the solemn homes of our glorified dead?

If so, let the Constitution remain as it is; tax the churches; expel from our books and courts of law the beneficent teachings of the holy religion we profess; take the free-loving, devil-worshipping religions of the world, and give them the place before State law that they now have before the laws of the United States. Then tear down

your prisons, and build only the gallows and guillotine; put knives into the belts of your boys, and revolvers into the hands of your girls. Welcome the age of reason, which covered France with headless corpses, and wait until a merciful earth opens and swallows you up.

But if our fathers died that we might be free to do right and not wrong, let us Christianize the Constitution. Let us hang this banner on our outer wall, and say to all mankind, "We welcome you, not to the bondage of rum, but the heaven of home; not to endless labor, but to Sabbaths of rest; not to blasphemy of God's name, but to fruitful fields where his blessing abides forever. If you are pleased with our platform, come; if not, stay away; for we are a people whose God is the Lord."

IT IS NOT IMPRACTICABLE.

But, says one, Without doubt, you are right, only you can't accomplish your end. This and ignorance are the two obstacles most difficult to overcome. It is quite enough to discourage one, to see how many chickens are wearing boots and pantaloons; some of them venturing their weak little cackles in the pulpits of our land. Men who never ask whether a thing is right, but always if it can be done. To such men let me say, the right is always practical, and what should be done can be done.

In a world where slavery was universal, fetters have been smitten from the millions of limbs. In a world drunk with blood, great nations have settled grave questions without the arbitrament of the sword; and Christianity, which eighteen hundred years ago had only a fallen cross and an empty grave, now controls the social life of the civilized world. When I hear these faint hearts whining about the uselessness of manly endeavor in an unpopular cause, I long for the old prophet of Israel, thus they may see the horses of fire, and the chariots of fire; for Luther, with his "Here I stand;" and Knox, with his "Give me Scotland, or I die."

It was a beautiful fiction of the Greeks, that in time of battle the spirits of departed heroes warred in clouds above the contending hosts. Who can doubt that this thought nerved Leonidas when he counted his scant three hundred swords away in the Thes-salian hills, and Miltiades, as he led his ten thousand against the Persian army of a million men on the blood-red plains of Marathon?

But we of the Christian army have the truth which was faintly shadowed by the Grecian fable; for when the heavens were opened, John saw Michael and his angels contending with Satan and his angels. Let us then take courage. We fight not alone. We are surrounded by a great cloud of witnesses.

If we listen, we may hear from the voiceful past words of strength and hope. Luther from his well beloved Rhine, Zwingli from the snowy Alps, Latimer and Ridley from Smithfield, and Knox from Scotia's glens, with an uncounted host of mighty dead, say to our own loved land,—

Oh, America! latest born of the nations of the earth! Be true to thy God, be true to thyself, be true to the world. So shall the conflict of law cease for ever; so shall white-robed angels guard thy shores; so shall thy banner float forever, with its white of peace, its blue of heaven, and its red of everlasting glory.

At the close of this address the Rev. S. F. Scovel led in prayer, and the Convention adjourned to meet the next morning at half-past nine o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS OF THURSDAY, FEB. 5.

MORNING SESSION.

The interest manifested during the second day of the Convention was even greater than during the opening sessions. The large Hall, apparently crowded to its utmost capacity the preceding day, was still more densely filled in the passage ways and halls. At different times hundreds of persons were patiently standing, unable to obtain seats during the long sessions of the Convention.

Mr. Brunot called the Convention to order, and introduced the Rev. J. F. Core, who opened the proceedings with prayer.

The following gentlemen were appointed a committee to receive and report on the petitions to Congress which were forwarded to the Convention; Rev. W. C. Williams of Washington, Iowa, George Silver, Esq., of New York, Rev. J. P. Sankey, of New York, William Wills, Esq., of Pittsburgh, Rev. A. J. McFarland, of Pa., Rev. M. Ormond of West Virginia, and Rev. T. Brown, of Iowa, and Rev. J. R. Hill, of Michigan.

A Committee of Finance was also appointed, consisting of the following gentlemen: Henry Martin, Esq., of Cincinnati, Daniel Wilson, Esq., of Allegheny, and Revs. C. D. Trumbull, of Iowa, J. McCracken, of Missouri, John Edgar, of New York, and T. A. Sproull, of Pennsylvania.

A number of addresses followed, which the limits of this report forbid being here reproduced. Though not prepared beforehand, like the larger addresses, they were one of the most interesting and animated features of the Convention. Among the speakers were President H. H. George and Rev. G. L. Kalb, of Ohio, and Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, of New York.

The Committee on Resolutions, through the Rev. J. P. Lytle, Chairman, announced that their report consisted of two parts: First, a Declaration of Principles, and Second, Resolutions. The Declaration of Principles was first read by President George P. Hays, D. D., and was adopted by a rising vote. The whole report, as finally amended and adopted, is as follows:

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

The friends of National Reform, in general convention assembled, do hereby make the following declaration of their position, principles and objects, and cordially invite the co-operation of all who accept in whole or in part the views herein set forth:

1st. This country was settled and its institutions founded by those who believe in God and accept His Word as the law of their lives, and this, their religious faith, was not an external feature, ingrafted on their political existence, but an original, fundamental and essential element of it, manifesting itself in their criminal code, as well as their recognition of God's sovereignty and their subjection in the colonial charters, the Declaration of Independence, the early State Constitutions, and other official acts and documents. These Christian features of our American civilization and national life were indispensable forces for the restraint of vice, the development of virtue, and the unification of the people; and we desire to maintain and perpetuate the same, believing that every effort for their obliteration tends directly towards social disorganization.

2d. Whether recognized or not, the eternal truth remains, that Jesus Christ is the Ruler of the nations of the earth, and will hold them as nations accountable for their doings; and remembering how in various forms reverence for God has marked the civil life of this nation, we most profoundly regret that the Constitution of the United States, which is our fundamental law, contains no explicit recognition of God's sovereignty, or of His law as the standard of morality; and we declare our purpose by every legitimate means to seek its amendment in this regard, and now inscribe on our banner, God's moral law the nation's guide.

3d. Such an amendment is of high importance in view of the overshadowing influence of a written Constitution in moulding the morals and laws of a people. All experience shows that the two cannot remain permanently separated. If we, as a nation, do not, therefore, bring up the Constitution in this respect to the level of the moral sentiment of the people, it will surely bring the people down to its condition of ignoring and disregarding God.

4th. In seeking this amendment we are laboring for these most practical results, namely: the perpetuation of the Sabbath; the proper regard for an oath; the integrity and purity of the marriage relation; the retention of the Bible in the schools; the suppression of intemperance; the enforcement of law; and the maintenance of all the other Christian features of our civilization, without the humanizing and enlightening influences of which man's progress must cease, and the continuance of free government become impossible.

5th. The adoption of such an Amendment to the Constitution would bring no more union of Church and State in the future than there has been in the past; but as, by amendment number one we are effectually guarded from all danger of such union, we seek by this to guard against the equal peril of the practical adoption by the State of atheism, by which virtue shall be fettered, and vice turned loose; and further, we declare our readiness to accept either a modification of the preamble, or an additional amendment, in any form of words that shall secure effectually the end sought for; but rejoicing in the success of the past, and pressed by the demands of the present in the spreading of political corruption, we hereby pledge ourselves to each other, to the nation, and to God, to labor on with unflagging patience and determined perseverance, until it is written in the fundamental law of this nation, that the Bible is its standard of morality, and Jehovah its God.

THE RESOLUTIONS.

Resolved, 1. That in the unexampled progress of the cause of this Association during the past year, in the gathering of this large and enthusiastic assembly from all parts of the country, and in the words of cheer received from influential friends representing our educational institutions, the army of the United States, and the secular press, we have reason for profound gratitude to Almighty God, and encouragement to prosecute the aims of the Association with renewed vigor.

2. That our cause is vital, not only to the religious, but also to the moral, intellectual, and material interests of our country; and that not Christianity alone, but patriotism as well, prompt us to energetic and persevering efforts to achieve its ultimate triumph.

3. That in the omission of an explicit recognition of Almighty God and the supremacy of his law from the Constitution of the United States, we recognize one of the fruitful sources of the wide-spread and ever-increasing demoralization of our national life, as seen in frequent and flagrant instances of official corruption, in the lowered tone of commercial honor and honesty, in the relaxation of the sacred ties of the family, in the prevalence of social vices and crimes of violence, and in the rising spirit of lawlessness.

4. That while we would not underrate, or despise the number and power of our opponents, we feel unfaltering confidence in the final and complete triumph of our principles, believing them to be inseparably connected with the prosperity and perpetuity of the nation.

5. That we appeal with confidence to the friends who, by their prayers, labors, and contributions, have sustained this movement in the past, to continue and increase their exertions in its behalf, assured that the reward of these exertions will be as great as the cause in which they are spent is glorious.

When the vast audience arose in adopting the Declaration of Principles, solemnly pledging themselves to one another to the nation, and to God, to labor unflinchingly in the cause, there was a manifest stirring of all hearts. When over a thousand earnest men thus covenant with God and with each other, great results may be expected.

Eloquent and effective addresses were made during the discussion of the resolutions by the Rev. M. Keiffer, D. D., Pres. G. P. Hays, D. D., R. H. Pollock, D. D., J. W. Bain, J. F. Core, J. P. Lytle, R. A. McAyeal, Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D., and others, which cannot be inserted here for want of room. Reports of these addresses were given in the daily papers of Pittsburgh.

The morning session was closed with the benediction, pronounced by the Rev. G. L. Kalb.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

President Brunot called the convention to order at two o'clock, and it was opened with prayer by the Rev. Dr. Hill, of Blairsville.

A number more of addresses were made on the resolutions before the final vote was taken for their adoption.

Mr. Owens, the assistant Secretary, then read the

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Executive Committee of the National Association respectfully reports:

1. That the work of the association has been prosecuted with increasing encouragement and success during the past year.

2. The General Secretary has continued to devote his whole time to the work, and his labors are detailed in the report.

3. Twenty-eight thousand copies of the proceedings of the last Convention, as published in the "CHRISTIAN STATESMAN," were judiciously distributed, and two thousand copies in pamphlet form. The result has demonstrated that information concerning the objects of our movement, and the reasons for it, is all that is needed to rally the great majority of Christian people to its support.

4. The CHRISTIAN STATESMAN has been published during the year with a gratifying growth in its list of subscribers. The promotion of its circulation is recommended to all friends of the cause as a most effective means of co-operating in the work.

5. The receipts of the Association during the past year, including the balance of \$44.83 reported to the last convention, have been \$5,655.56, and the expenditures \$5,681.27, leaving a balance of \$45.71 now due the Treasurer.

6. Pursuant to the instructions of the last convention, petitions to Congress have been widely circulated. The full list of names gathered thus far will be reported during your proceedings, and the work will be continued throughout the year.

7. We present the following recommendations:

First. That the work of the association be prosecuted during the next year, by the same general methods as hitherto.

Second, That a subscription be entered into, at this Convention, for the Treasury of the Association.

Third, That the delegates to the Convention be recommended to hold meetings in their respective localities, to ratify its proceedings, and to form, wherever practicable, societies auxiliary to the National Association.

Respectfully submitted, T. P. STEVENSON, *Chairman*.

The report was received and adopted.

Mr. McAllister then read the report referred to in that of the Executive Committee.

GENERAL SECRETARY'S REPORT.

During the past year the work of the National Association for the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States has come more distinctly into public view than ever before, and is therefore now better understood. It is seen and admitted by the most intelligent and candid of our opponents that our work is no Quixotic scheme, but a most practical undertaking. As heretofore, the efforts of the year have been directed to the following points:

1. The conservation of assailed and endangered Christian features of our national and State governments, such as the use of the Bible in the common schools, the judicial oath, Sabbath laws, and all similar institutions.

2. The reformation of whatever is defective or wrong in our laws and institutions, and the cure of political corruption.

3. As a means to these ends the dissemination by the press, and from the platform and pulpit, of the truth in regard to the connection of civil government and religion.

4. In all this work the association has held aloft the proposed Religious Amendment as a banner under which to rally all the friends of our Christian institutions, aiming at its ultimate insertion in our fundamental law as the result of calm and peaceful discussion throughout the country, as the embodiment of the conviction of the people, as a legal basis for existing institutions, and as an educating power for our advancement in Christian civilization.

The principal assaults within the year upon the Christian elements of our political organization have been the decision by the Supreme Court of Ohio, reversing the decision of the Superior Court of Cincinnati, and sustaining the expulsion of the Bible from the schools, and the attempts to overthrow Sabbath law and order in New York, Chicago, St. Louis and other smaller cities and towns. In all these assaults aid has been afforded, directly and indirectly, by the association and its members. With the constantly renewed and organized efforts of so-called "Liberals," this part of our work becomes every year more important.

In laboring for the protection of our best institutions against these irreligious and communistic assaults, a specially important work has been done this year in connection with the State Constitutional Conventions that have been in session in Pennsylvania and Ohio. Immediately after the New York Convention efforts were put forth to secure suitable religious acknowledgments in the new Constitution for Pennsylvania. Petitions were printed and widely circulated, and agents employed to hold meetings and obtain signatures. Although the time was brief, many signatures were obtained, and the prayer of the petitioners ably urged before the Convention by the Rev. T. P. Stevenson and John Alexander, Esq., of Philadelphia. It is but just to state that these efforts had no small influence in securing the devout acknowledgment, incomplete though it is, which graces the preamble of the Constitution recently adopted.

Petitions have also been sent to every portion of Ohio, and already it is said, by good authority, that "more petitions have probably been presented to the Constitutional Convention now in session in Cincinnati, asking that such religious acknowledgments may be placed in the preamble of the Constitution as shall indicate that this is a Christian Commonwealth, and shall place all the Christian laws, institutions and usages of the government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the State, than have been presented on any other subject." It is confidently expected that these petitions, which will yet be greatly multiplied, will not be without good effect.

Petitions to Congress have also been widely circulated. The result of this part of the work will appear in the report of the Committee on Petitions. It may be said here, however, that this work is only fairly begun. It must be vigorously prosecuted throughout the present year.

A large increase in the number of documents distributed marks the past year. Thirty thousand copies of the proceedings of the New York Convention have been circulated, twenty-eight thousand of the condensed report in the *Statesman*, and two

thousand copies of the pamphlet volume of about one hundred pages. Five thousand of Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the *Christian Statesman* tracts have been put in circulation. A brief argument for the religious amendment, and another brief tract giving the "Demands of Liberalism," and showing that the issues between Christian government and irreligious secularism has been fairly joined, have been very widely distributed—about 22,250 of each having been judiciously scattered throughout the country.

Of public meetings, so far as can be ascertained, some four hundred have been held. Many of them have been under the auspices of auxiliary societies, nearly one hundred of which are now organized, with a total membership of well up to 10,000. This is but a small proportion of the friends of the movement, as the work of organization has not been pressed forward. It is proposed to publish at as early a day as possible a full list of auxiliary associations, with names of officers and the number of members.

Many of the meetings and discussions since the last National Convention have been of rare interest and importance. It is fitting also to mention here the conspicuous place which the question of the relation of our Constitution and government to Christianity, and the Religious Amendment, held in the general conference of the Evangelical Alliance. The influence of that discussion was even more widely and powerfully felt, perhaps, in favor of our cause, than one of our own national Conventions. The noble utterances of our President and Corresponding Secretary, when others were silent, on behalf of our Christian institutions, illustrates the significant fact that when the connection between our government and Christianity is ignored or condemned, the justification and maintenance of that connection devolves mainly, if not entirely, upon the Religious Amendment Association.

It is with peculiar gratification that I refer to the fifty men—the large number of whom forbids the particular mention of any—who have given themselves, oftentimes at great sacrifice, to devoted labors for weeks, and in some instances for months, in holding and addressing meetings. Doubtless there are others of whom no tidings have been heard. Their only compensation has been the large, and in some instances magnificent audiences that have crowded to hear them, and the abundant success of their labors. This convention is what it is in consequence of their untiring efforts and the active, prayerful, and generous co-operation of multitudes of friends throughout the land.

The past year has numbered a larger array of accessions to our ranks than any two, three or perhaps five preceding years. Not only have numerous influential men joined the gathering hosts, but many heretofore opposed have come over to our side. Language like that found in some of the letters read yesterday is becoming common: "The only time I doubted the propriety of this movement was before I looked into it." "I confess I have cherished hostility or doubts, but now I give my voice and hand with yours."

It is hoped that the arrangements for this Convention, the details of which have been multiplied many times above those of former occasions, have proved satisfactory. In conducting them, courteous and favorable treatment has been met on every hand, with a single exception. The presiding officer of the Pittsburgh and Connellsville Railroad, the solitary instance of all the many railroads centering in Pittsburgh, peremptorily declined to make any reduction of fare to delegates to this Convention, on account of the nature of the object for which it met.

In closing, let me suggest to the members of the convention the importance of re-

porting the proceedings in religious weeklies and local papers. No better service can be done for the cause. In every community a ratification meeting should be held, and the work of organizing auxiliary associations and securing signatures to petitions energetically promoted.

Respectfully submitted.

D. McALLISTER.

A subscription was then made for the Treasury of the National Association, the amount of which was reported by the Committee of Finance. A considerable number both of cash and time subscriptions were added after the adjournment of the Convention. The sum total of receipts at and subsequent to the Convention, up to Feb. 19, was as follows:

Total cash receipts,	\$1,126.10
Total time subscriptions to be paid during the year, . . .	3,242.00
Total Convention subscription,	\$4,368.10

The following gentlemen were appointed a Committee to nominate the officers of the National Association for the ensuing year:—Revs. Dr. Pollock, J. Alford, J. R. Killam, Samuel Collins, J. W. Sproull, S. J. Crowe, and S. Carlisle, and J. D. Baldwin, Esq., and W. R. Hamilton, M.D.

The Rev. W. C. Williamson, Chairman of the Committee on Petitions, presented the following report:

The Committee on Petitions to Congress report, that owing to the failure to properly indorse the papers in our hands, it is impossible to specify the number of petitions from the several States. The nearest estimate of the whole number of signatures is 54,228.

The Committee recommend that the petitions received be taken in charge by the Executive Committee, and that the circulation of petitions be continued in every section of the country, to be forwarded to the next annual meeting of this Association, and that the steps in order to their being carried to their proper destiny be left to the consideration of that Convention.

The Report was adopted.

After a number of brief addresses the Convention adjourned to meet at 7 o'clock. The benediction was pronounced by Dr. J. T. Cooper.

EVENING SESSION.

The Convention was called to order by President Brunot, and was opened with prayer by Prof. S. J. Wilson, D.D.

President George, on behalf of the Committee of Enrolment, submitted the following report:

The whole number of members enrolled is one thousand and sixty-four; of these six hundred and forty-one are certified from auxiliary societies and other bodies of citizens. Eighteen States are represented.

The President then introduced the Rev. Dr. A. A. Hodge, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Western Seminary, who delivered the following address:

ADDRESS OF DR. HODGE.

Although my instincts and convictions have always been thoroughly in sympathy with this movement, yet, as I am not experienced in its exact analysis, and in the close study of the several departments of the general question, I shall not attempt the detailed discussion of any one topic, but only a general statement of what I understand to be the state of the controversy, and the reason for the demands we make.

I. There are three great parties to this debate: 1st. The constantly growing band of Christian men who believe that this work is the duty of the hour, in which the salvation of the country is involved.

2d. The company of intelligent infidels who conscientiously disbelieve our principles, and their natural allies, the licentious, and the trimmers for place.

3d. The entire mass of our fellow-Christians, the overwhelming majority of the nation, who really agree with us in our principles, but who are, as yet, imperfectly informed as to our ends, our methods, or the necessity for, or the feasibility of, our enterprise. With the second class we can have no compromises—we must either convince or defeat them by sheer force. With the third class we can have no controversy. Mutual explanations must remove all misconceptions, and lead to a cordial co-operation.

II. The end we propose is in the widest sense Catholic, and not sectarian. It is simply the recognition within its legitimate sphere by the National government of the general truth of theism and Christianity. These are fundamental to the creed and traditional institutions of all Roman Catholics alike, Gallican and Ultramontane, of all German Lutherans and French Huguenots, of Anglican Churchmen, high and broad and low, of English and American Puritans and Scotch Covenanters. This movement ought to provoke no controversy. In the end it will occasion no division, except between theist and atheist, Christian and infidel.

III. The point we want recognized in the Constitution is not a dogma of the churches, nor a theory of the schools, but a simple fact, everywhere operating, and universally recognized by believers. Jesus Christ is, as a fact, "Ruler among the nations," (1.) providentially guiding their affairs, and determining their destinies; (2.) morally, by the revelation of truth and duty, the exhibition of motives, and the

stimulus and discipline of providentially arranged circumstances. If this be a matter of fact generally believed, should not a great self-governing community like this nation, conscious of its acts and of their character, make a distinct profession of its allegiance?

IV. The practical recognition of this fact is no new thing in American history. It has formed a prominent characteristic of our successive governments, colonial, state, and national, from the beginning. We propose the adoption of no new principles, and no radical change of customs. We propose only to recognize, as a fundamental principle in the National written Constitution, that which has been a universally recognized principle of national life from the first. We aim not at change, but at conservation. We want to preserve through all coming time, and consistently carry out in all departments of law, the hitherto universally admitted fact, that Christianity is an element in the common law of the land. In very various ways has this great principle been confessed by our nation from the beginning. This is plain in all the history of the Mother Country, whose common law we have inherited; in the institutions and innumerable formal acts of all the original colonies; in all the laws of the States and the national government, with respect to blasphemy, oaths, the Sabbath, marriage, divorce, etc.; in the appointment of Christian chaplains for the army and navy, and for Congress, and by their daily appeals to God, in the presence, and with the assent, of the officers of the government in their official character; in the distinct assertion of these principles in the inaugural addresses of all our Presidents, and in their official appointment of days of public thanksgiving and fasting; and, above all, in the entire system of education in this country for the first two hundred years of its history, which was the creation of earnest Christians for the promotion of Christian objects. In all these schools and academies, Christianity was recognized by devotional exercises, by specific instruction, and was largely embodied in dictionaries, geographies, histories, works of general science and literature. Our present rapidly expanding system of national education has grown out of this early and long-established system. We retain the text books and educational literature, the fruit of the Christianity of a past age, and we retain also the Christian traditions of Bible-reading, etc. The great debate which divides Catholics and Protestants on this subject, relates not at all to the place of Christianity in the school, but rather to the form, quality, and quantity of Christianity to be taught. The one party demands for their children full denominational instruction. The other party being satisfied, with us, with the recognition of Christ as the Supreme Ruler through his Providence, and the Supreme Teacher through his Word. On the contrary, it is our opponents who propose to change all this. They propose to abolish the oath, and the civil Sabbath, as unjust discriminations against the unbelievers. They propose to modify the law of marriage, to do away with the sacredness of the family, the rights of men in their wives, and the rights of parents in their children. They propose to purge Christianity from our entire system of national education, from the text books of the schools, and the instruction of the teachers.

We desire to emphasize this fact with all our force. We are not innovators, but conservators of our race and nation. We want to establish no theological crotchet, nor to secure the ascendancy of any class of religious persons. We want simply to make part of the permanent written law what has always from the beginning formed an effective and universally acquiesced in part of the unwritten law. It is essential for our success that we make this understood. The mass of any people are not affected by abstract reasoning, but by appeal to their emotions or their in-

terests. They are satisfied with the present, with which they are familiar; indisposed to attempt reforms, the entire consequences of which they are not able to anticipate. Naturally, and with a healthy instinct, they shrink from the suggestions of innovators, but respond quickly when they are summoned to assent to principles and to defend institutions inherited from their fathers, the benefits of which they realize from experience.

V. Observe, 1st. The explicit assertion of this principle in the written law can possibly invade no right of a dissenting minority which they possess under the historical conditions above explained. They can possess no rights which the unwritten Constitution and immemorial traditions and practical usages of our nation do not give them.

2d. Every nation and its institutions have necessarily a character historically determined, which is essential to its identity, into which all succeeding generations are born, and to which all immigrants from abroad voluntarily accede. As the nation was formed by its English descent and inheritance, by colonial experience and its republican government, so has it been formed by its Christianity. As no man's liberty is invaded by accepting the historical social structure of the community into which he is born, or into which he voluntarily migrates, so no man's liberty is invaded by the maintenance in every legal way by the nation of its fundamental religious character.

3d. If the Christian majority prevail and maintain Christian institutions, the infidel minority will be just where they have always been, in the exact position in which they voluntarily accepted citizenship; and while they may be restrained from some self-indulgence, they can be constrained to no violation of their convictions.

On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose that precious heritage from their fathers which they hold in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law of man, and take the consequences.

VI. There are two Constitutions of the nation, the written and the unwritten. Neither of these are arbitrary conventions or artificial constructions. These, in every land and age, are the result of processes of growth, and they embody in the form of recognized law or usage the great historically established facts of national character and condition. This is true of our written Constitution. Afterwards, when the facts have been providentially changed, the written Constitution has been amended to express these facts. With respect to the national religion, an important omission was made at the first. That omission, of course, has altered none of the facts of the case, but under changed conditions, it may bring them into question.

We claim that since the religion of the nation and its government is a matter of fact and ancient traditional right, there is the same propriety in announcing that fact in the fundamental law of the land that there is for formulating any other principle which gives character to the government. If it be thought desirable to insist in the bond on a republican form of government, it must be quite as essential to provide that the government, whatever be its form, shall be obedient to the revealed will of God.

VII. We are now brought to an historical crisis, when the necessity for the formal constitutional recognition of Christianity is becoming more and more keenly appreciated by ever increasing numbers.

1. Nations, like individuals, are brought by growth or by special discipline to

clearer self-consciousness. The relations of much, taken for granted as true, are not at first understood. And the importance of defining principles long considered as self-evident, may be made apparent by their denial, or by newly developed opposition.

2. Multitudes of disappointed political and social theorists have recently immigrated to our land, who are disseminating theories of human rights and of man's relation to God which are in inconsistent with the facts and traditions of our government as with the Christian religion. We point to the facts of our history and to the present abundant evidences of our national Christianity, and claim that our written law shall be conformed to these facts. Our opponents, in the name of the abstract rights of man, irrespective of all historical conditions, point to the accidental omission of the recognition of Christianity in our written Constitution, and claim that our history and traditions, and the living faith of the majority, shall be de-nationalized in order to conform our practice to the silence of our fundamental law. Ours were the fathers whose lives and work made this nation, and whose faith gave character to our institutions,—Catholics, Episcopalians, Puritans, Huguenots, Quakers, English, Scotch, Irish, Dutch and German Presbyterians and Lutherans and Wesleyans,—while our opponents, for the most part, unless as we let them share in our heritage, are as destitute of a country as they are of a God.

3. We are now engaged in perfecting and extending the most comprehensive and effective system of national education ever known among men. The whole continent will be brought under one comprehensive administration, embracing all the children of the nation, and all grades of education from the common school to the university. It is alike absurd in principle, and in flat contradiction with universal experience, to suppose that the education of the understanding can be separated from the education of the reason and conscience, or that the communication of knowledge can be separated from the formation of moral and religious principles. Hitherto, as a general fact, all the literary apparatus and methods of our education have been moulded by Christianity. Shall it remain so in the future? Shall the minority, on the plea of freedom, deny the majority the privilege of having their children taught history and science as interpretations of God's work? Can the majority be deceived into believing that absolute silence as to God's agency, is not, under such circumstances, equivalent to denial, and that the withholding of all religion from a scheme of education is not equivalent to the inculcation of atheism? As the government of the nation prepares itself for the tremendous responsibility of educating all the youth of the land, who shall forbid that it shall write among its changeless fundamental laws, that immemorial faith of our Saxon race and of our nation, that as men can successfully rule others only as they are themselves ruled by Christ, so they can successfully teach others only as they are themselves first taught by Christ?

VIII. The character of Christian belongs to the nation regarded not only as a collection of individuals, but as well when regarded as an organized community exercising the functions of civil government. This we claim to be true of our nation, both as a matter of principle and as an unquestioned fact.

1. As a matter of principle, no man can deny moral and religious character to nations and to their governments, who does not deny them to the individuals who compose them. If they are intelligent, free, brave, moral, energetic, obviously the nation is so. Now, government is a function of the nation as a providentially organized community. The nation, as thus historically organized, is the government. The character of the people forms the character of the nation, and the character of

the nation forms the character of the government. In every act of the government which concerns moral and religious questions, it must be obedient to the great Law-giver or disobedient, religious or irreligious.

The family and the nation and the civil government are as much creatures of God as the individuals that compose them. Men are born under government and can only exist under governmental conditions. Civil government is as certainly ordained of God as is the church, and each is His instrument in different spheres. The evangelist is a minister of God to preach, and the magistrate is a minister of God to rule. The Christian Scriptures are a revelation of God's will to each in his own sphere. The Christian minister receives the word of God as his law in the Church, and interprets it for himself. The Christian magistrate receives the same word as his rule in the State, so far as it casts light on human duties and relations involved in the functions of government, and the magistrate interprets it for himself.

It is self-evident that if a legislator be a Christian, and at the same time believes that Christ has expressed his will on any question concerned in legislation, he must, when he comes to make laws, act as he believes. If he be a Christian in his heart, he will be a Christian in his vote. If the majority of the legislature agree with him, the laws will be Christian. The character of the legislature must be expressed in their legislation, and the character of the nation should be expressed in the character of its representatives; otherwise it is so far not represented.

2. This principle is no less true as a matter of fact, and is always in exact proportion to the freedom of the nation. Every government must enact laws and ordain regulations involving religious questions. Every government has done so, our own included, to the present day, as is abundantly known to all, and shown above. If a government be a usurping tyranny, it may misrepresent the people in its action concerning religion. But if the nation be free, the government must act in this regard, as in all others, as the true organ of the nation, and represent its character. Our nation has always been free and Christian, and therefore the action of our government has in the main expressed the Christian faith of the people. If we remain Christian and free, our government shall be Christian also. And since the issue is joined, and the flag of the atheist raised, we demand that the standard bearing the symbols of Christ's crown be nailed, together with the insignia of liberty, over the capitol of the nation.

The Hon. T. H. Baird Patterson was next introduced, who spoke as follows:

THE RELATION OF THE GOVERNMENT AND CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO CHRISTIANITY.

BY T. H. BAIRD PATTERSON.

Mr. President, Fellow-Delegates, and Fellow-Citizens, Pennsylvanians to the manor born, children of the Pilgrim Fathers, of Scotch and Irish Presbyterian martyrs, of Huguenot refugees, of Christian ancestors of various creeds, who for conscience sake left home and friends to found us a Christian nation, where civil and religious liberty are secured to all:

Be not misled by the assertion that the movement agitated by this Conven-

tion tends to religious intolerance, to wedding Church and State. No such tendency exists. On the contrary, this movement claims nothing but to secure in the preamble of our National Constitution an acknowledgment of the supremacy of God, and the Christian character of our nation, such as is now generally and authoritatively conceded to be the law of our land. Such then being the nature of this movement, is it of any vital practical importance, or is it the mere phantasy of theoretical visionaries?

Warned by unfavorable symptoms in our national life, at present manifested only too plainly, let us stop and reflect. In questions of national life and policy, we have two sources of guidance, Revelation and History; two kinds of relations, Godward and manward.

From a Christian standpoint, as regards the relation of our nation toward God, or, indeed, as regards its relation both toward God and man for those of us who accept God's supremacy, Revelation and the Bible as binding, this movement is certainly of vital and practical importance, it would seem. For, in view of the numerous admonitions and commendations by God to nations in regard to acknowledging him and serving him, the duty to acknowledge him in our National Constitution seems clear beyond doubt, and the omission to mention his name therein appears sinful negligence.

And now let us, as statesmen, pass on to view this movement *manward*, as concerning the relations of the nation to individuals, and of the nation to other nations. History supplies us the only human aid for our guidance, and that is the lamp of experience. We know of no way of judging of the future, but by the past. Lifting our eyes from the present, let us gaze out over the ocean of Time, over lines of century-waves which, farther and farther receding, close nearer and nearer together, and blend at last into one unbroken tide away toward the horizon of remote antiquity. Let us think of the wars of departed ages; of the empires and republics Time has seen created and destroyed; of the nations whose birth it has witnessed, whose progress it has watched, whose annihilation it has noted; of the life and death, the grandeur and decay of nations through nearly six thousand slowly revolving years.

While Time by successive years, and mankind by succeeding generations, are continuous, why do decay and death appear to be inevitable incidents of national existence?

The answer at once suggests itself. In the ancient world we see nations with their natural tendencies free from the restraining influences of Christianity, and there we can best judge of the diseases of national life. There, war was the one pursuit of the nations; "might makes right," their international law, and centralization their chief characteristic. Nations rose and fell in rapid succession; instability was their great defect; nations conquering by force, became corrupt through the wealth acquired by unjust conquest; then luxurious and effeminate, and in their turn fell a prey to some more warlike people. "Greece fell by the hands of her own people. The man of Macedonia did not do the work of destruction. It was already done by her own corruptions, banishments and dissensions." "Romans betrayed Rome. The legions were bought and sold; but the people offered the tribute money." Thus, in vain man tried to solve the mighty problem of national existence. And ancient civilization sank at the fall of the Roman Empire amid the ruins of society and morality.

At this dark age God interposed, and sent the Gospel of Peace to rescue men and nations from this moral chaos. "After the fall of the Roman Empire," says Guizot,

"all the civilization of Europe was embraced within the limits of the Christian Church." Beginning with individuals, Christianity extended its influence to nations; and the progress of civilization, down to the present time, has been one continued struggle between Christianity and justice, on the one side, and a spirit of war and injustice on the other. "According as a nation adopted Christianity and justice, as opposed to war and injustice, it decided its character." This is the testimony of Carlyle. Thus, France, Germany, and England rose to their present positions, while Spain, Austria, and Poland have retrograded. Thus we see that ancient civilization, founded on principles of war and injustice, necessarily perished; while modern civilization, based on the heaven-born principles, Christianity, justice, and peace, ever eliminates war and ever progresses toward the time foretold as the highest goal of national greatness, when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Such are the teachings and progress of the nations of the past: let us improve the results for those who come after us. Just as the aloe shoots up, and in one stately blossom pours forth the life which has been calmly collecting for a century, so it would appear that the nations of the past were destined to pour forth the accumulated political experience in one luxurious flower of rare proportions—our constitutional form of government. But our fair bloom depends for its vitality on the invigorating sap of public virtue, produced and circulated through its system of Christian sunlight and air from above. Let corruption or misguided public opinion injure or destroy these sources of life, and our blossom of fair promise will fade away in premature decay, and fruitless germ. Let us guard well our centennial bloom, for in it centre the life and hopes, not of our nation alone, but of the world.

Throwing aside our well known tendency to shut our eyes against painful truths, let us conscientiously look into the actual condition of our nation to-day, willing to know the whole truth and to provide for it. From a review of the past, we conclude with the greatest statesmen and jurists, that in the virtue of the people ultimately rests all governmental institutions; that luxury and corruption are fatal to any nation unless speedily checked.

What are our symptoms? Is our nation still characterized by simplicity, straightforward truthfulness, devotion to principle, fair dealing, honesty, &c., as it was fifty or a hundred years ago? We can each answer this question from ourselves and our surroundings. I will only illustrate by the example of Tweed, representing as he does the prevailing faith of our nation to-day—belief in the almighty dollar. Certainly his confidence was not surprising. He had proved his creed. He had seen money work miracles. He had seen himself, a man of no cleverness and of no advantages, rising swiftly by means of it from insignificant poverty to the control of a great party. It had made him master of one of the greatest cities in the world. It had secured for him governors, legislatures, councils, and legal and executive authorities of every kind. He invested in lands and judges. He bought dogs and lawyers. He silenced the press with a golden muzzle, and money made his will law. Here was a man that wanted nothing that money could not buy; was it strange that he had unbounded faith in it? Every form of virtue was to him a mere affectation, a more or less ingenious "strike" for money. If a man spoke of honesty, patriotism, self-respect, the public welfare, public opinion, truth, justice, right, Tweed smiled at the fine phrases in which the auctioneer, anxious to sell himself, cried, "going, going!" Argument, reason, decency, were meaningless to him. If an opponent held on, he simply asked, "How much?" The world was a

market to him. Life was a bargain! Yet it is fearfully true that Tweedism is a predominant phase of the business, corporate, political life of our nation to-day. Corruption is rampant. A mortal disease is already upon our nation's vitals, and has reached an advanced stage in our great cities, the plague spots of a Republic.

What cure? What remedy? Is there any antidote for this corrupting poison that is vitiating the vital currents of our social organism?

Now, leaving out of view the annunciations of the Bible on this subject, which are of course conclusive to all sincere Christians, let us turn to the testimony of history and philosophy for an answer. We find the mustard seed of the Bethlehem manger has become a mighty tree for healing and shelter to nations and men. We find warlike barbarism transformed to peaceful civilization; we find the principles of Geneva International law replacing the old code, "Might makes right;" we find Christian wives and mothers wielding acknowledged authority, where formerly they only served the caprices and passions of man; we even find Christian women in Ohio going to the dens of vice, and, by prayer and moral suasion, waging against liquor dealers a crusade, successful where men and laws have failed. We see these and many other progressive changes. What is the elevating influence which has been introduced into society? How have these progressive changes been produced and how shall they be preserved and increased?

From the most careful historical and philosophical research and observation, we conclude that "Man is a religious being—he will worship;" therein he is distinguished from the mere brute. From the same source we conclude that "Man by worshipping, becomes assimilated to the moral character of the object which he worships." This is an invariable principle, operating with the certainty of cause and effect. The worshipper looks upon the character of the objects which he worships as the standard of perfection. Herein consists the transforming power of devoted affection for objects both human and Divine. Assuming these facts, which we might spend a whole night in illustrating, and proving beyond all doubt, from the history of all nations, let us assume, as admitted truth, that man is the highest of all material existences.

Now, man being the highest material creature, how can he elevate himself above himself? He may take as the object of worship the purest, holiest specimen of mankind, and assimilate thereto, but cannot thereby elevate himself beyond the ideal. Of course mere material objects of worship, being lower than himself, would degrade rather than elevate man. Hence the corrupting and degrading tendencies of the worship of money, of material wealth and power, the mammon of to-day. Thence originates the necessity, recognized by the thinkers of all ages for a God above and beyond man and all material existences. Thence arises the elevating power of any religion proclaiming such a God, and the consequent searching of men for the best religion and for the highest and most elevated and elevating God. The experience of the past has, we claim, demonstrated that our Christian God, revealed to us in the Bible, best supplies such elevating object of worship; and therefore candid thinkers generally admit that Christianity is the most necessary and elevating influence in national life. Even the infidel Bolingbroke, felt compelled to say, "Some religion is necessary (in a nation), and we cannot get a better one" (than the Christian religion.) The Jacobins, having obtained a decree abolishing Christianity, and loosing the people from all the restraints and obligations of religion, the consequences were too horrible to detail. The disgraceful public exhibition of a woman, as "Goddess of Reason," and the dissolution of all the most sacred ties of

society followed. But the atrocities practised were too enormous for even France, in the delirium of revolutionary freedom, to bear, and the monster Robespierre sought honor and popularity by introducing a decree that there was a God who ought to be worshipped,—and for restoring "the functions and obligations of religion." The same statesman who gives the above details, concludes: "Let the obligations of Christianity be withdrawn, and all the restraints of human legislation would be a rope of sand. What is it but the awful apprehension of accountability to Him who knoweth the very thoughts and intents of the heart,—a hope of reward or a fear of punishment in a future world,—that prevents our earth from becoming literally a 'field of blood?' If the influence of social arrangements depended on mere notions of vague and baseless morality, how frail would be the security of our peace and safety! No government ever yet existed without religion; nor has there been ever an infidel statesman of intelligence who believed it could subsist without that sure foundation. * * * There is no safe or efficient reliance but upon the religious principle, and accordingly this has been resorted to in all countries, and in all ages, to secure fidelity." Says Chief Justice Shaw, "Contumelious reproaches and profane ridicule of Christ, or of the Holy Scriptures, have the same evil effect in sapping the foundations of society and of public order." Says Lord Hale, Chief Justice of England, "Such kind of wicked, blasphemous words are not only an offence to God and religion, but a crime against the laws, state, and government, and, therefore, punishable in the Court of King's Bench. For to say religion is a cheat, is to subvert all those obligations whereby civil society is preserved." Omitting similar words of Chief Justice Story and others, listen to the following judicial opinion of Chief Justice Parsons: "Christianity had long been promulgated, its pretensions and excellencies well known, and its divine authority admitted. This religion was found to rest on the morals adapted to man, in all possible ranks and conditions, situations, and circumstances, by conforming to which he would be ameliorated and improved in all the relations of human life; and to furnish the most efficacious sanctions, by bringing to light a future state of retribution. And this religion, as understood by Protestants, tending, by its effects, to make every man submitting to its influence a better husband, parent, child, neighbor, citizen and magistrate, was by the people (of Massachusetts) established as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution," and ought, we claim, to be likewise established by the people of the United States, as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution.

Now, such being the fundamental and essential character and importance of our God and the Christian religion, and such their influence in preserving individual and social morality and elevating man, we claim that it is most important that we, the people of the United States, should so proclaim and acknowledge them, individually and as a nation, in our National Constitution, so that we may thus place in our national charter of rights these our most sacred inheritances. So that we may thus record in black and white our position as a nation upon this most important of all the mooted questions of the day, and for ever negative the demands of those irreligious libertines who would wish to raise objections to the Christian customs and observances of our people, little dreaming that granting their demands would as certainly tumble our governmental fabric about our ears as that night would follow day. Such men are the visionaries, and not we. For we only seek, owing to the hostile claims of such visionaries, to transfer the acknowledgment of God and Christianity from the common and statute law of our land and people, as it exists now by all authority worthy of note, to the written language of our National Constitution, so as to trans-

mit the same without even a cavil to our children. Here let us note the true status of Christianity and God under the laws, Constitution and government of the United States, as matters now stand. Our nation is a Union, not of the several States, but of the people residing within the United States. And "we, the people of the United States," retain all our common law and statutory rights, which we have not expressly delegated to our national authorities or restricted in the Declaration of Rights in our National or State Constitutions. So that our United States Constitution leaves undisturbed and enforces the common law and statutory rights of the people, living throughout the various States, except wherein the express language of the Constitution modifies those rights. Among the most sacred of these common law and statutory rights to-day, stand the acknowledgment of our God and Christianity. This is the unmistakable sense of the decisions of all our courts, both state and national. We, therefore, desire this acknowledgment, not only to place it beyond all doubt and legal construction, which necessarily attend a matter depending on the blending together of common and statute law; but also for the purpose of calling the attention of the people of this and other nations to the fundamental importance of such safeguards as will prevent the loss of our religious securities by mere supineness and indifference,—those insidious enemies of liberty. In view of all the considerations we have advanced, we claim that this movement is one of great practical importance; for without the spirit and inspiration of true Christianity to keep a nation from corruption and decay, certain national death must follow. You may build your national edifice with all the embellishments of architectural grandeur; you may construct it with all the durability of the Pyramids; you may dedicate it to reason, science and intellectual culture; you may decorate it with all the beauties of nature and art, you may fill it with all the luxuries and inventions of modern times; you may consecrate it with the purest patriotism, and adorn it with the wreaths of victory, and deck it with the Star Spangled Banner; and yet, if reverence for our God has departed, and Christianity, the life principle of our nation, is gone, your magnificent national structure will remain, like the Pyramids, only as the mausoleum of a forgotten people, or, like the Tower of Babel, as a monument of striving against God.

The Rev. S. F. Scovel was introduced by Mr. Brunot, and gave the following address:

NATURAL MORALS AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

BY REV. S. F. SCOVEL.

After expressing his gratification at hearing a Christian lawyer (the Hon. T. H. Baird Patterson, who had preceded him,) in favor of the movement, proceeded as follows: My text for this novel sermon is found in the eighth verse of the first chapter of the new gospel of Liberalism.

Being designed to rid this entirely too-Christian country of a great burden, it may not be too modest and cannot be too specific. It reads thus:

"We demand that all laws looking to the enforcement of 'Christian' morality shall be abrogated, and that all laws shall be conformed to the requirements of natural morality, equal rights, and impartial liberty." (*The Eighth "Demand of Liberalism."*)

The phrase "equal rights and impartial liberty" is the blazing tail to this comet. It covers large space, especially in the American heavens, but (as the astronomers all assure us) is "too thin" to frighten any body. Above all, it must not be suffered to distract our gaze from the nucleus, in which, indeed, I think there is enough solid matter to eclipse the sun. And, in short, that is just what they propose to do with it. Listen! "We demand that all laws looking to the enforcement of 'Christian' morality shall be abrogated, and that all laws shall be conformed to the requirements of natural morality."

This is radical enough. It admits there are laws founded on Christian morality and looking to its enforcement, but, so far as this part of our national edifice is concerned, it must be taken down to the foundations, and rebuilt on an entirely different pattern. The plummet, rule and line must be changed. What has been built upon Christ, ("other foundation can no man lay,") must be built now on Nature.

THE ISSUE IS SQUARE AND CLEAR.

We ought to look before we leap, for this is a long way down. The change which they seek is so deep-going and far-reaching, and feels so closely after the life-strings, that we will surely be pardoned for pausing and asking for the considerations which support this demand. There must be something to be gained where so much is to be lost!

Christian morals are in possession, and the *onus probandi* must rest upon those who desire change. They must reverse the lesson of the past, and show the oppression and misery which have resulted from the type of morals chosen at its foundation by this nation. They must show the vast superiority of natural morals. They must overcome the inertia of a century's success.

When it is answered that all this is urged against our own position in seeking the Religious Amendment, we submit and accept the task, and they must do the same. We are ready to prove the need of our amendment by our past history, and stand waiting for them to prove the need of the change they advocate. But we would not exchange places for the world. We seek to cut out the last tucks by which the garment shall be stretched to meet the life throbbing within it; they seek to accommodate the boy to his trousers; and because the original pattern has become too small, to cut the growing legs to suit. We have only an omission to supply, they have a century of commissions to bring the nation to repentance for. We are trying to develop the bud of our national century-plant just ready to burst; they seek to change its life and make it a cryptogamous plant, and keep only the thorny outside of the cactus. We are willing to take our part of the *onus probandi*, and they must take theirs.

While waiting for this, a work they have scarcely taken in yet in its magnitude, we can very easily see certain very clear and strong reasons for retaining the laws that are founded upon Christian morality. One only of these I have now time to adduce.

The first great consideration which disposes us not to yield to this demand, is the conviction that upon comparison we shall find much that we have hitherto counted not only good but indispensable, lost in the substitution proposed.

We consider that Christian morality in its most condensed expression is the moral law as given upon Sinai, with all the added light and force it derives from its re-annunciation by Christ, from His exemplifying life and spiritualizing interpretation. Our general estimate of the value of this moral standard was admirably expressed

by the lamented Guthrie when he called the Decalogue "the ten stones of the arch on which our domestic happiness, the purity of society, the security of life and property, and the prosperity of nations stand." "It was these commandments," he adds, "which the Son of God came from heaven (our substitute) to obey; not to abrogate, but to enforce them; on His cross to exalt, not in his tomb to bury them; and cementing the shattered arch with His precious blood, to lend to laws that had the highest authority of Sinai the no less solemn and more affecting sanction of Calvary."—"Moses," *Sunday Magazine*, April, 1867.

To see, then, whether and what we shall lose by the substitution proposed, we must look at the various precepts of this moral law, and compare them with the teachings of natural morality, which we suppose to mean the collective result of the philosophy and practice of the world, ancient and modern, all the light of the Christian religion being excluded.

As to the *First and Second Commandments*, we know that when Nature dictated morals, natural morals polluted religion. "They changed the truth of God into a lie."

Men deified all their own passions and appetites, and provided a seat in Olympus for every propensity. They thus depressed themselves by lowering that which alone could have elevated them.

The history of the growth of idolatry is a commentary on this proposition never to be forgotten. The world was perfectly successful in degrading the original conception of God, and making it the instrument of destruction! How few echoes of the doctrine of the true God, linger among the polluted fanes of an ancient and of uncivilized worship.

Men were unwilling to be spiritual because they were immoral. The object worshipped was depraved, and the methods deteriorated.

Nor is there any better hope than this in the modern Pantheism, or Positivism, or Atheism. All-God or No-God, it ends in the same. There is an idolatry with no images.

Natural morality ignores the *Third Commandment*, and provides no penalty for profanity.

Nothing is sacred! Among the Greek and Roman writers oaths abound.

But nothing is more awful and imbruting when unrestrained by other moral checks than blasphemy.

Reverence for God gone; will reverence for man continue?

The *Fourth Commandment* is at once swept away by "natural" morality.

The *Fifth Commandment* receives its "coup de grace" from natural morality, by substituting, for the honor of parents,—

1. Increasing withdrawal of reverence from them, and from all subordinate and delegated authorities?

2. Exposure of parents to death by the uncivilized. It would scarcely claim, per contra, the tyranny of parents living, and the terror of their manes when dead, which chain the Chinaman, and prevent railroads in the "Flowery Land."

Concerning the *Sixth Commandment* the world has more widely wandered still, and yet this interest might, one would think, be most safely of all left to the care of natural morals.

CRUELTY IN WORSHIP.

Human sacrifices were appointed by the most venerated Oracles, prevailed among the Phœnicians and Canaanites, Moabites and Ammonites, Egyptians, Athenians,

Lacedæmonians, Romans, Carthaginians, Germans, Gauls, and Britons. They were customary, in some places frequent, even daily, and on extraordinary occasions reached large numbers.

SLAVERY.

Aristotle taught that the Athenians might lawfully invade and enslave any people who, in their opinion, were fit to be made slaves.—*Polit. Lib. II. c. 14.*

The same philosopher taught that a slave was "a tool with a soul in it."

Life and death power was given the Master, and all the lesser power that went with it.

If any say that Christian morality wavered there too, we must answer:

1. That Christian morality, having a definite standard, must be judged by what it is, not by what it is said to be, and Christian morality never sanctioned slavery.

2. That even Christian moralists, who approved our form of it, practised a very different kind of slavery from that of the East, or of Greece and Rome.

Under natural morals, many sorts of private revenge are held legitimate.

The law is perplexed by the extent and depth of popular convictions on these points, though they are often absurd and partial; and not unfrequently justice is defrauded of its victim.

Anger is not tabooed by any stigma of inconvenience like that of Christ's teaching, and the fear of murder. Even the "ira furor brevis est" of the Latin sage, approaches it only from the lower side of advantage.

SUICIDE.

Natural morals make man his own end, and leave him without inspiration or consolation under failure. Stoicism was the purest philosophy in Greece, and transplanted to Rome, but it has an ugly record about suicide. "Good not to wait for death," it said, "but to choose one's own way of dying." Courage was above all, and the greatest of courage against the great enemy. "As they believed neither in God, nor in a future life, they had no other resource but to exalt the importance and value of man, and to identify the notion of right with that of personal dignity. To all objections drawn from the contradictions of humanity, or from those of nature, they added, 'Thou canst die.' When they endeavored to prove that pain did not exist, their last argument was death. 'Dost thou complain of being a slave?' Seneca would say, 'Look at that tree,—freedom hangs upon its branches.'"—*Le Devoir, Jules Simon*, pp. 382, 3.

And you remember the recent justification of putting out of the way the hopelessly invalid.

"It ought to be right to put to death such suffering Christians as I am," was written in Astor Bristed's last letter.

The case stands the same with infanticide and natural morality! The humane and maternal feelings themselves wither under the touch of a wrong conviction of the right!

CHILD MURDER IN CHINA.

A correspondent writes that the Chinese parent hails with joy the little son that is born to him, but turns away with disgust, and even anger, from the poor babe when it is a girl, and often kills it with his own hand, and apparently without the slightest remorse. The writer adds: "You can hardly believe that any father could kill his own child—the little wee babe, so innocent, so weak! And yet, I suppose, this child-murder is committed here every day in the year. I know of hardly a family

that has not been guilty of it. And, what seems more dreadful, even the mother apparently feels no pity or love for the female babe, hurried out of the world away from her arms. I have talked with many upon the subject, and, as yet, have met but one who manifested the least sorrow for the loss of her child. She did not seem to feel naturally. She described her joy when her first little one, a little girl, was given her; what a nice child it was—how much she loved it. But her husband took it, had a tub of water brought into the room where she was, and then put the little one's head down into the water, holding it there, while the poor mother begged for its life. Then she shut her eyes and stopped her ears that she might not see or hear the dreadful tragedy."

Infanticide not only exists in China and India, but existed also in Rome. "Infanticide was regulated by the laws of Romulus, and the practice approved, both by Plutarch and Seneca." At Rome a new-born infant was not held legitimate unless the father lifted it up from the ground, and placed it on his bosom. "Plato taught (*de Repub. lib. V.*) the lawfulness and expedience of exposing children in particular cases, and Aristotle also, of abortion."—(*Polit. lib. VII. c. 17.*) The exposure of infants, and the putting to death of children who were weak or imperfect in form, was allowed in Sparta by Lycurgus. At Athens it was "enacted that infants who appeared to be maimed should either be killed or exposed."—*Horne, I., 11, 12*, eleventh edition, English.

There is no foundation in reason for the transfer of power to take life from individual to government, and no delegation by Divine power.

And with this falls all right to aggressive war in case of rebellion: for this is but capital punishment enlarged.

NATURAL MORALS AND LICENTIOUSNESS.

The *Seventh Commandment* has always been and must always be the battle-ground between natural and Christian morals. Here the race has always been unsettled; here antediluvian sin began; hence postdiluvian corruption spreads out. Here was the plague spot in the highest civilization of antiquity. Here is where men waver most to-day.

Natural morality, instead of giving us Eden again, gave the race the flood and Sodom, and then gave Israel innumerable sorrows, and then blasted the civilization of east and west and the Grecian peninsula; just because it ignored the *Seventh Commandment*. The peril of licentiousness underlies the race in every condition other than that of Christian morality.

It is inevitable. Cut off the protecting growth of moral laws even for one generation, and this evil crop sprouts and takes the field.

The indulgence shown to incipient forms of vice, in even the most refined societies of the world, proves how ready it is to seize its first opportunity, and become dominant.

The tendency to this evil seems so omnipresent in human history that it has suborned religion for its purveyor constantly. It will come in through the temple door, if everything else be shut, unless the presence of Christ be there.

Natural evil is so strong that it has perverted even the Christian faith from the purity of its morals. Remember the abominations of the "Ethics of Gnosticism."—*See Schaff's History of Christian Church.*

Nothing can more conclusively prove that there can be no admixture of moral systems here. The pure air comes only from Heaven. Mr. Bayne says: "If we

drive away from us religion when arrayed in the spotless robe of Christianity, if we will insist that we can devise for ourselves, with the aid of reason and science, better rules of action and modes of life than are offered by that Gospel, * * * we will find religion, by an unalterable necessity, re-appearing among us, but now in a polluted garment, and bearing a curse rather than a blessing. Is there no lesson for the age in our St. Simonisms and Mormonisms? The History of Rome illustrates this!"—(*Bayne's Christian Life, p. 513.*)

Natural morality has taught and written in defence of the sins against the *Seventh Commandment* since literature began. See Mandeville's book, (England, 1733,) entitled "*Private Vices, Public Benefits*," in which he maintains that "the luxury and voluptuousness of one class in society give employment and support to another class." It was the first attempt to found vice upon the principles of political economy, and justify it by a reference to the general welfare.

Lord Bolingbroke taught that "the only foundation of modesty is vanity or prejudice; that polygamy is part of the religion of nature, and that adultery is no violation of the law of nature."—*Horne, I., p. 28.*

Hume teaches that "adultery must be practised if men would obtain all the advantages of life; that, if generally practised, it would in time cease to be scandalous, and if practised secretly and frequently, it would by degrees come to be thought no crime at all."

"Both Voltaire and Helvetius advocated the unlimited gratification of the sensual appetites, and the latter held that it is not agreeable to policy to regard gallantry (that is, unlawful intercourse with married women,) as a vice in a moral sense; and, that if men will call it a vice, it must be acknowledged that there are vices which are useful in certain ages and countries."—(*Horne, I., p. 29.*)

Rousseau—a thief, a liar and a debauched profligate, who sent his children to the poor house for support—during the whole of his life, according to his own printed "confession," also had recourse to feelings as his standard of morality. "I have only to consult myself," said he, "concerning what I do. All that I feel to be right, is right. Whatever I feel to be wrong, is wrong. All the morality of our actions lies in the judgment we ourselves form of them." And just before the French revolution broke out, it is a known fact that the idea of moral obligation was exploded among the infidel clans in every part of France.

If any further answer were needed, this is a significant one: The private lives of the most distinguished opponents of Christianity have been themselves exhibitions of the weakness and evil of natural morality—Voltaire, Rousseau, Frederick the Great, Tindall and Hobbes.

It is strange and yet true, that scarcely an anti-Christian writer on morals has ever lived, but has been found guilty of some infraction of this command, or of some loose teaching which encouraged disobedience. Even Stuart Mill is no exception.

That to which the abolition of Christian morality leaves us is plainly:

1. The legalization of prostitution, which despite all that may be said, does fix it among the permissible things, does tend to remove the fearful natural penalties by which God punishes it, and gives it a deceptive safety. Who that knows anything of continental morality the heritage of centuries of misconduct, the evidence of unchristian standards and the miserable curse of hundreds of thousands of each generation, can regard without horror the substitution which would infallibly make us worse than Rome or Naples, Vienna or Paris.

2. The next result will be the ascertained impossibility of legislating against per-

nicious literature and obscene displays. Whatever is now—and there is much—is in violation of law, and when there is moral sentiment enough, the law can be executed.

3. Then we may regard the reproach of Mormonism, and any other form of life men may choose, as settled upon the nation, and its wholesale destruction of human souls as perpetuated to the day of doom. It is surprising to see how readily such a conclusion has been already acquiesced in in some quarters. Witness the discussions on the Callom bill.

NATURAL MORALS AND PROPERTY.

Natural morality and the right of property, bring us to the *Eighth and Tenth Commandments*. They settle it. This is the battle-ground between the classes as the Seventh Commandment is in relation to sex. It is among the "brennende frage," this inability of natural morality to agree on a basis of property. Europe is convulsed to contortion over it; and the throes have touched our own eastern border.

Theft, it is said on the authority of Diodorus Siculus, was permitted in Egypt; and in Sparta we know it was encouraged as an exhibition of skill and hardihood.

Where the Eighth and Tenth Commandments are, there can be no rioting or communism, for that delivers property from the aggressor, and even the aggressor from his own selfishness.

[The temporary communism of Christian love, when a man may give all to the poor, if he will, is decidedly different from that which relies upon barricades and petroleum.]

NATURAL MORALS AND TRUTH.

Coming to the *Ninth Commandment*, we perceive that natural morals give no security for truthfulness.

Menander said: "A lie is better than the truth."

Plato says: "He may lie who knows how to do it."

Maximus Tyrius says: "There is nothing decorous in truth but when it is profitable."

Both Plato and the Stoics are said to "have framed a Jesuitical distinction between lying in words and an assent to an untruth, which they called lying in the soul. The first they permitted."

Truth now prevails just in proportion, in North and South Europe, as Christian morals do.

Carleton Coffin gives this account of a class of Hindoos whose instruction he witnessed:

"The next exercise is on the mind, with Abercrombie's 'Philosophy of the Moral Feelings' for a text book. Subject: 'Testimony.' Upon this they are at sea. The Hindoo is wanting in all sense of moral obligation. His sacred book—his Bible—contains no code of moral laws. His priest sets human example of duplicity. He never trusts his dispute with his neighbor to the arbitrament of a native judge, who has ever an open palm for him who will pay the highest fee."

We understand in Pennsylvania, that natural morals give no guarantee for truth as against interest. Accordingly, we incorporate in our Bill of Rights the section which excepts to the testimony of those who deny the being of God, and the existence of a future state of rewards and punishments. And this section we have twice *refused* to remove.

God and a future imply Christian morals, because they are the motives to keep us up to the standard from which all courts of justice are a confession of our liability to fall.

Here, then, is the state of the question:

Natural morality, on every point of essential value to society, has wandered, and is polluted in its teachings, and affords no shadow of evidence that it will not debase and disorder the whole fabric of social life.

Natural morality, taking away Christianity, would make us responsible for the infanticide of Chinamen; the polygamy of Utah, the legalization of prostitution, and the abominations of the Oneida community; the sudden disturbances of mob-law and private revenge; the destructive doctrines of Communism; the Fetishism of our (uncivilized) negroes; the code duello; and the lottery. It must encourage dishonesty, and fail to rebuke blasphemy. It opens the way for theft and rapine, and the doctrine that might makes right. It opens the window for every imprisoned dove of virtue to fly away; and flings wide the door for every beastly sin to enter. The outlook is not encouraging.

President George P. Hays, D.D., was next introduced by the President, and spoke as follows:

THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE OF THE NATION.

ADDRESS OF PRES. GEO. P. HAYS, D.D.

In the effort to anchor this nation to fundamental truth on the subject of morality, it is often asked, would it not be better to address yourselves to the people? Is the nation a thing other than the people? We shall understand this point best by beginning with a private corporation, and then going up to public corporations. Suppose Brown, Jones and Smith organize a bank, under the name of the Merchants' National bank, and so receive deposits and lend money on notes and mortgages. Who owns this banking house? Who is sued when payment of deposits is refused? Who sues when mortgages are foreclosed? Not Brown, surely, nor Jones nor Smith, but the bank. And suppose Brown sells out to Davis, and Jones to Jenkins, and Smith to Wilson, is then the bank not the same national bank? Does any one deny its liability for its deposits, and its right to collect on the notes it holds? And now suppose Brown, Jones and Smith, organize themselves again into a bank, by the name of the Merchants' National bank, can they collect the mortgages they took before? But, if the corporation is not distinct from the individuals, they ought to, as they are the same men in the same business, and with the same name as before.

Now, all the experience of governments shows that it is of vital importance that these corporations should be bound by strict regulations. In the late Constitutional Convention there was no subject of greater difficulty than that of corporations, and every effort was made to control and restrain them by provisions so explicit that they could not be evaded. The very same Convention found a like difficulty in laying down regulations for the government of the State itself. The State is only a public corporation, as the bank is a private one, and the call for a Convention to amend the Constitution came from the people, not so much because they felt that new regulations were needed for the private corporations, as that they felt that the old Constitution did not properly regulate the duties of the State itself. The organization, duties and powers of the government itself, in its executive, legislative and judicial departments, in their judgment, needed revision, and they called the Convention for

that work. By explicit declaration, by oaths and penalties, that Convention sought to enforce it on the minds and bind it to the consciences of future officers that they were to do right. Would it have been out of place for them to have said, the Bible is for this State the standard of morality, and, on all subjects concerning which the State takes action, it is to be the guide?

What makes this subject of such deep personal importance to all of us, is the fact, that the State is what might be called a necessary corporation. A bank is an optional corporation. If you and I do not like it, we need not enter it; or if, being in it, a course be adopted which we disapprove of, we can leave it. It is at our own option whether we enter it, how long we stay in it, and when we go out. It is not so with the State. By our birth we become part of it, are under its protection and subject to its punishments. We cannot get out of it. If we leave the United States, we go to some other country, and are part of society and under law there. Our only escape is to flee to some Robinson Crusoe island, and be sure that no man Friday ever comes on it with us; for if he does, it is certain that either we will be his master, or he ours, and both master and slave accountable to God for the use of our power. If it be important that these optional corporations, like banks and such like, should be under proper charter regulations, when men can leave them if they wish, how much more important is it that these necessary corporations, like the State and the family, should be held fast to the eternal morals of God. Over the private corporations there is the state, and over the state is the nation, to see that it does not transgress the proper boundaries of its duty. But who is over the nation, but God? If history teaches any lesson, it teaches this especially, that no nation can turn aside from God's laws, and live; and as nations are necessary corporations, part of which you and I and our posterity must be, we are urged to bind nations generally, and especially our own nation, to God's truth, by every fear of national calamities, and every desire for our nation's prosperity.

The place to put such a clause, anchoring this nation to the truth, is in the Constitution. What are the different parts of a constitution? They are, mainly, these three: first, the statutory, which organizes the different branches of the government, declaring how many branches there shall be, and how many and what officers shall discharge the duties of each branch. Thus our national Constitution declares that there shall be three separate and independent branches, the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial; and that the Legislative shall be vested in two Houses of Congress. Under the Articles of Confederation there was but one house.

The next department of a Constitution is that which is affirmatory; declaring what ends these different branches shall seek, separately and collectively: thus the Constitution declares that "the United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

The present Constitution of this State makes it the duty of the State to maintain a system of public education, and appropriate not less than one million dollars for its support each year. Now, what more important duty could be set before a government than the promotion of that morality, whose standard is the Bible, and so shaping all their governmental action, that the people shall be kept from the crimes which are a nation's overthrow, such as perjury, theft, fraud, oppression, and public corruption?

The third department of a Constitution is that which is prohibitory; in which it is forbidden to do certain things, and which, when it does undertake to do them, makes such action null and void: thus, Congress can make no "ex post facto" law, or lay any export tax; and our present State Constitution prohibits special legislation on

many subjects. Now, as the Constitution of the United States prohibits an established religion, and guaranties to every citizen the free exercise of his religion, all the hue-and-cry about a union of Church and State is mere wasted breath, until somebody proposes to repeal that first amendment. So far as this movement is concerned, no friend of it proposes any such nonsense. What is proposed is, that, while that existing amendment properly guards us from the perilous extreme of a union of Church and State on the one hand, we shall by another amendment, (I would put it among the amendments, and not in the preamble,) be equally guarded from as perilous an extreme,—atheism, secularism, and utter wreck of fundamental morals, on the other. The mechanism of the heavens is only made perfect by the balancing of the centrifugal and centripetal forces. At present this nation is amply guarded by centrifugal forces, in its prohibitions from any peril of falling into the hands of the Church; but it is at the mercy of these, wanting, as it does, any centripetal force to keep it from wandering utterly away from all the light and heat and protection of the Son of God. The picture of all worlds given over to their centrifugal forces, and madly fleeing from all centres, out into the chaotic darkness of absolute space, is but a glimpse of the overthrow of nations that break away from God. Safety for this nation can only be found in avoiding atheism, as well as Church and State union.

But we are told the way to avoid these extremes, is to let the whole subject alone. Neutrality is the only way to avoid it properly, because the people are greatly divided on the subject. But it is an important question whether neutrality does avoid it. Let us look at some parallel cases. The people of this country are greatly divided between tariff and free trade. Here, and in the Northeast, they are greatly benefited by a tariff. In the West and South, free trade is just as great a gain; for then they sell their wheat and cotton dear, and buy their imports cheap. Now, suppose the government say, Because the people are so much divided, we will take a neutral position, and do nothing. South Carolina may have free trade if she wants it, and Pittsburgh may pay a tariff if she wants it. We will not interfere at all. How would you like that, iron masters, steel factors and wool growers? Why, that is blank, flat free trade. To lay on no tariff is itself free trade. The West is greatly exercised about transportation just now. How would they like to have Congress and the Legislatures say, We do not want to take sides. We will do nothing in the matter. We will be neutral in the fight between you and the railroads. The most avaricious and unscrupulous railroad man ever born could ask no more than that; and such neutrality is just what the grangers are now complaining to Congress about. Neutrality on the subject we are now discussing, is just such a decision, and a taking sides for atheism, as neutrality is taking sides for free trade and railroads. The place in which we meet* furnishes just the sharp, clean-cut illustration we need to bring this point out. Here is an immense library, whose managers do not propose to be sectarian or establish a religion. In accordance with this plan, suppose their book committee refuses to buy any book that is published or written by a Presbyterian, a Methodist, an Episcopalian, a Baptist, or a Roman Catholic, and as there are many who do not believe in the Sabbath or the Bible, they allow neither the Bible nor any book that defends or upholds it a place on their shelves, and run the institution on the Sabbath just as on other days. But as they are liberal thinkers, they must not exclude any because of their skepticism, and so they buy Voltaire, Comte, Hume, Hobbes, Kant, Renan, Strauss, Darwin and Tom Paine, and then come before the public and ask for pa-

* Mercantile Library Hall.

trouge because they are neutral on religion. Shades of the W's,—Walker, Worcester and Webster! what a definition of neutrality!!! What more could atheists do, if they were getting up a library of their own? Just so, to attempt neutrality by a nation that has crimes to punish, and rights of property to decide, is equally impossible, and can only issue in practical but utter atheism. Our only safety is to shun atheism as we have shunned a union of Church and State, for the one has not been a whit behind the other in the ruin that marks its path in history; and the only manly, logical and effective way of evading it, is by adopting some such an amendment as we here propose.

We are often asked, Why do you not go to the people? Can an amendment of the Constitution make the people moral? If I understand the matter, that is just what we have been doing—"going to the people." This convention was called as a step in getting at the people, and if my eyes do not deceive me, we have got at a multitude of people. Since this movement was first started at a little meeting of a few people at Xenia, Ohio, in 1863, it has had marvellous success with the people. Politicians are very timid of us now. They will grow wise soon. Society in this country, politically considered, is very much like a pyramid, very broad at the base and very small at the top. At the base, and for more than half its altitude, are the quiet, thoughtful people with no ambitions for office, and contented no matter who is elected, so all goes on well. Above them is the drifting population who are shaken with every wind and quiver like a jelly cone on a wedding table, while above them on the apex ride the politicians. To ride there with safety is no small feat of dexterity, and, as a rule, it is most important to the rider to keep those shaky people who will scratch their ticket for a drink of whisky, in as good a humor as possible. But where are they when the foundations move? Those foundation masses set themselves on the salary question, and reluctant obstinacy had to yield. It is to that class that this appeal is made, and by them it is best received; and when once they are moved, hundreds of politicians who would not for the world commit themselves to it now, will bawl themselves hoarse in applause, and swear they knew it would be so, and were on that side from the beginning. Patience and perseverance! The friends of our country are settling their repose on the Rock of Ages, and the generations and nations of the future shall build after the same example.

Dr. Pollock, chairman of the nominating committee, presented the following list of officers for the Association, who were unanimously elected.

PRESIDENT:

The Hon. FELIX R. BRUNOT, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

His Excellency, JAMES M. HARVEY, *United States Senate.*

His Excellency, ROBERT W. FURNAS, *Governor of Nebraska.*

The Hon. LORENZO SAWYER, *U. S. Circuit Court, San Francisco, Cal.*

The Hon. G. W. BROOKS, *U. S. District Court of North Carolina.*

The Hon. EDGAR W. HILLYER, *U. S. District Court of Nevada.*

OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

The Hon. B. F. SAFFOLD, *Supreme Court of Alabama.*

The Hon. C. C. COLE, LL.D., *Supreme Court of Iowa.*

The Hon. JAMES PHELPS, *Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut.*

The Hon. M. B. HAGANS, *Superior Court of Cincinnati.*

The Hon. J. ROCKWELL, *Superior Court of Massachusetts.*

The Hon. GEO. W. FRENCH, *Chief Justice Supreme Court of Dakota.*

The Hon. DAVID NOGGLES, *Chief Justice Supreme Court of Idaho.*

The Hon. MADISON E. HOLLISTER, *Supreme Court of Idaho.*

The Hon. ROGER S. GREENE, *Supreme Court of Washington Territory.*

The Hon. HEZEKIAH S. JOHNSON, *Supreme Court of New Mexico.*

The Hon. J. W. KINGMAN, *Supreme Court of Wyoming Territory.*

The Hon. C. M. HAWLEY, *Late Justice Supreme Court of Utah.*

The Hon. SAMUEL S. FISHER, *Cincinnati, Ohio.*

The Hon. J. W. McCLURG, *Ex-Governor of Missouri.*

The Hon. W. H. CUMBACK, *Ex-Lieut-Governor of Indiana.*

The Rt. Rev. WM. INGRAHAM KIP, D.D., *Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of California.*

Pres. DAVID H. COCHRAN, Ph.D., LL.D., *Collegiate and Polytechnic Institute Brooklyn, N. Y.*

The Rev. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D., *Presb. Sem. of Northwest, Chicago, Ills.*

Prof. E. KIRBY SMITH, *University of Nashville, Tenn.*

The Rev. GEO. B. CHEEVER, D.D., *Englewood, N. Y.*

Prof. W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., *Princeton Theo. Sem., N. Y.*

The Rev. WM. R. NICHOLSON, D.D., *Newark, N. Y.*

Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., *Union College, N. Y.*

The Right Rev. JOHN B. KERFOOT, *Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Pittsburgh.*

The Rev. T. L. CUYLER, D.D., *Brooklyn, N. Y.*

The Rev. LEVI SCOTT, D.D., *Bishop of the M. E. Church, Delaware.*

Prof. JULIUS H. SEELYE, D.D., *Amherst College, Mass.*

The Right Rev. F. D. HUNTINGDON, D.D., *Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Central N. Y.*

The Rev. A. A. MINER, D.D., *President of Tuft's College, Mass.*

The Rev. JONATHAN EDWARDS, D.D., *Peoria, Ill.*

The Rev. EDMUND S. JAMES, D.D., *Bishop of M. E. Church, N. Y.*

The Rev. HENRY J. FOX, D.D., *Charleston, S. C.*

The Right Rev. W. M. GREEN, D.D., *Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Mississippi.*

Vice-Chancellor J. GORGAS, *University of the South, Tennessee.*

The Right Rev. G. T. BEDELL, D.D., *Assistant Bishop of Prot. Epis. Church, Ohio.*

The Hon. ELLIS A. APGAR, *State Superintendent of Public Instruction, New Jersey.*

The Hon. A. N. FISHER, *State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada.*

The Hon. JOSIAH H. DRUMMOND, LL.D., *Portland, Maine.*

JOHN ALEXANDER, Esq., *Philadelphia, Pa.*

CHARLES G. NAZRO, Esq., *Boston, Mass.*

The Hon. THOMAS W. BICKNELL, *Commissioner of Public Schools, R. I.*

JAMES W. TAYLOR, Esq., *Newburg, N. Y.*

WM. GETTY, Esq., *Philadelphia.*

The Right Rev. G. D. CUMMINS, D.D., *Bishop of Reformed Episcopal Church.*

The Rev. C. S. FINNEY, D.D., *President of Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.*
 The Rev. T. A. MORRIS, D.D., *Bishop of the M. E. Church, Springfield Ohio.*
 The Rev. J. H. McILVAINE, D.D., *Newark, N. J.*
 The Rev. M. SIMPSON, D.D., *Bishop of the M. E. Church, Philadelphia.*
 The Rev. J. BLANCHARD, D.D., *President of Wheaton College, Illinois.*
 Prof. O. N. STODDARD, LL.D., *Wooster University, Ohio.*
 Prof. J. R. W. SLOANE, D.D., *Ref. Pres. Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 The Rev. E. R. CRAVEN, D.D., *Newark, N. J.*
 The Rev. JOSEPH CUMMINS, D.D., LL.D., *President of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.*
 The Rev. STEPHEN H. TYNG, D.D., *New York.*
 The Rev. F. MERRICK, D.D., LL.D., *Pres. of the Ohio University, Delaware, O.*
 The Rev. JOHN B. DALES, D.D., *Philadelphia, Pa.*
 The Rev. JOSEPH T. COOPER, D.D., *Pittsburgh, Pa.*
 The Rev. Dr. J. BANVARD, *Paterson, N. J.*
 The Rev. C. H. EDGAR, D.D., *Easton, Pa.*
 The Rev. D. STEELE, D.D., *Philadelphia.*
 The Rev. JOHN S. STONE, D.D., *Epis. Theo. School, Cambridge, Mass.*
 The Rev. H. DYER, D.D., *Corresponding Sec. of Evan. Knowl. Society, N. Y.*
 The Rev. THOMAS SPOURL, D.D., *Ref. Pres. Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. W. F. KING, D.D., *Cornell College, Iowa.*
 Pres. JAMES W. STRONG, D.D., *Carleton College, Minn.*
 Pres. THOMAS HOLMES, D.D., *Union Christian College.*
 The Rev. DAVID R. KERR, D.D., *United Presbyterian Theological Seminary Allegheny, Pennsylvania.*
 The Hon. JAMES DAWSON, *Washington, Iowa.*
 JOSEPH KISSUK, Esq., *Newcastle.*
 The Rev. EDWIN B. WEBB, *Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston, Mass.*
 President J. F. COOK, LL.D., *La Grange College, Mo.*
 Chancellor ALEX. WINCHELL, LL.D., *Syracuse University, N. Y.*
 The Rev. DORUS CLARKE, D.D., *Boston, Mass.*
 Pres. SOLOMON POOL, D.D., *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.*
 Pres. WALTER HILLMAN, LL.D., *Central Female Institute, Miss.*
 Prof. EDMUND H. BENNETT, LL.D., *Boston University, Mass.*
 The Rev. R. BETHELL CLAXTON, D.D., *Divinity School, P. E. Church, West Phila.*
 Pres. A. J. McGLUMPHY, D.D., *Lincoln University, Illinois.*
 The Rev. B. P. AYDELOTT, D.D., *Cincinnati, Ohio.*
 S. H. FORD, LL.D., *Ed. Christian Repository, St. Louis, Mo.*
 Pres. L. H. HAMMOND, *Lebanon Valley College, Pa.*
 Pres. REUBEN ANDRUS, D.D., *Indiana Asbury University, Ind.*
 Pres. A. B. MILLER, D.D., *Waynesburg College, Pa.*
 Pres. CYRUS NUTT, D.D., LL.D., *Indiana State University, Ind.*
 The Rev. A. A. HODGE, D.D., *Western Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. GEORGE P. HAYS, D.D., *Washington and Jefferson College, Pa.*
 Pres. DANIEL RICE, D.D., *Logansport Female College, Ind.*
 The Rev. M. W. JACOBUS, D.D., *Western Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. P. M. BARTLETT, D.D., *Marysville College, Tenn.*
 Pres. DAVID A. WALLACE, D.D., *Monmouth College, Ills.*
 Pres. MILTON VALENTINE, D.D., *Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.*

The Rev. S. J. WILSON, D.D., *Western Theo. Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.*
 Pres. O. L. SMITH, D.D., *Emory College, Georgia.*

GENERAL SECRETARY:

The Rev. D. McALLISTER, 245 West Forty-ninth Street, New York.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY:

The Rev. T. P. STEVENSON, 104 North Sixth Street, Phila.

RECORDING SECRETARY:

The Rev. W. W. BARR, Philadelphia.

TREASURER:

SAMUEL AGNEW, Esq., 1126 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

The Secretaries and Treasurer of the Association, ex-officio.

R. B. STERLING, JOSHUA COWPLAND, JOHN ALEXANDER, JAMES S. MARTIN, The Rev. S. O. WYLIE, D.D., ROBERT TAYLOR, WM. McKNIGHT, THOMAS WALKER, M. McCONNELL, THOMAS BROWN, Philadelphia, Pa.
 HENRY HARRISON, ROBERT B. MAXWELL, WM. NEELY, WALTER T. MILLER, JAMES WIGGINS, HENRY O'NEILL, GEO. SILVER, JAS. SPENCE, HUGH CARLISLE, New York.
 The Rev. WM. S. OWENS, Indiana, Pa.
 D. CHESTNUT, Pittsburg, Pa.
 HENRY MARTIN, Cincinnati.

After the customary resolutions of thanks, at a late hour, the sessions of the Convention were closed. Before the pronouncing of the benediction, Mr. Brunot said,—

We will now adjourn in a few minutes, but I cannot allow you to go without returning my sincere thanks for your kindness to me as your chairman, and as President of the National Association. Not long ago, at a meeting of which the body was composed of Indians, after the speeches had been made and it was time to go, one chief was so anxious to be heard further that I delayed to hear him. He wanted but a few minutes more, but after speaking twenty minutes, he said, "Now you ought to stay here a month. I have told you a little of my heart, but it would take me three days to tell you all that is in my heart." It would take me three days to tell you all that I feel in my heart, and that is in my mind, on this subject that we are interested in. As I cannot get the three days,—at this time of the night, too,—I will close with bidding you an affectionate farewell.

The Convention then adjourned *sine die*, with the benediction by the Rev. S. F. Scovel.